S. HRG. 98-271 PT. 25

EMPLOYMENT-UNEMPLOYMENT

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE
CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

NINETY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

PART 25

FEBRUARY 3, MARCH 9, APRIL 6, MAY 4, AND JUNE 1, 1984

Printed for the use of the Joint Economic Committee

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

36-618 O WASHINGTON : 1984

J84-41

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

[Created pursuant to sec. 5(a) of Public Law 304, 79th Congress]

SENATE	HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
ROGER W. JEPSEN, Iowa, *Chairman*	LEE H. HAMILTON, Indiana,
WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR., Delaware	*Vice Chairman*
JAMES ABDNOR, South Dakota	GILLIS W. LONG, Louisiana
STEVEN D. SYMMS, Idaho	PARREN J. MITCHELL, Maryland
MACK MATTINGLY, Georgia	AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California
ALFONSE M. D'AMATO, New York	DAVID R. OBEY, Wisconsin
LLOYD BENTSEN, Texas	JAMES H. SCHEUER, New York
WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Wisconsin	CHALMERS P. WYLIE, Ohio
EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts	MARJORIE S. HOLT, Maryland
PAUL S. SARBANES, Maryland	DANIEL E. LUNGREN, California
	OLYMPIA J. SNOWE, Maine

DAN C. ROBERTS, *Executive Director* [1]
JAMES K. GALBRAITH, *Deputy Director*

[1] Mr. Roberts was appointed executive director on Apr. 30, 1984. Mr. Bruce R. Bartlett served as executive director until Mar. 23, 1984. During the interim period, Mr. Charles H. Bradford served as acting executive director.

CONTENTS

WITNESSES AND STATEMENTS

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1984

	Page
Jepsen, Hon. Roger W., chairman of the Joint Economic Committee: Opening statement	1
Proxmire, Hon. William, member of the Joint Economic Committee: Opening statement	2
Mitchell, Hon. Parren J., member of the Joint Economic Committee: Opening statement	2
Obey, Hon. David R., member of the Joint Economic Committee: Opening statement	3
Norwood, Hon. Janet L., Commissioner, Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor, accompanied by Kenneth V. Dalton, Associate Commissioner, Office of Prices and Living Conditions, and Thomas J. Plewes, Associate Commissioner, Office of Employment and Unemployment Statistics	3

FRIDAY, MARCH 9, 1984

Jepsen, Hon. Roger W., chairman of the Joint Economic Committee: Opening statement	57
Norwood, Hon. Janet L., Commissioner, Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor, accompanied by Kenneth V. Dalton, Associate Commissioner, Office of Prices and Living Conditions, and John Bregger, Chief, Division of Employment and Unemployment Analysis	58

FRIDAY, APRIL 6, 1984

Lungren, Hon. Daniel L., member of the Joint Economic Committee, presiding: Opening statement	91
Proxmire, Hon. William, member of the Joint Economic Committee: Opening statement	92
Norwood, Hon. Janet L., Commissioner, Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor, accompanied by Thomas J. Plewes, Associate Commissioner, Office of Employment and Unemployment Statistics; and Kenneth V. Dalton, Associate Commissioner, Office of Prices and Living Conditions	93

FRIDAY, MAY 4, 1984

Lungren, Hon. Daniel E., member of the Joint Economic Committee, presiding: Opening statement	131
Proxmire, Hon. William, member of the Joint Economic Committee: Opening statement	132
Norwood, Hon. Janet L., Commissioner, Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor, accompanied by Thomas J. Plewes, Associate Commissioner, Office of Employment and Unemployment Statistics; and Kenneth V. Dalton, Associate Commissioner, Office of Prices and Living Conditions	133

FRIDAY, JUNE 1, 1984

Lungren, Hon. Daniel E., member of the Joint Economic Committee, presiding: Opening statement	169

Page

Proxmire, Hon. William, member of the Joint Economic Committee: Opening statement 170
Norwood, Hon. Janet L., Commissioner, Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor, accompanied by Thomas J. Plewes, Associate Commissioner, Office of Employment and Unemployment Statistics; and Kenneth V. Dalton, Associate Commissioner, Office of Prices and Living Conditions ... 171

SUBMISSIONS FOR THE RECORD

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1984

Norwood, Hon. Janet L., et al.:
Article entitled "Centennial," from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, January 1984 5
Table reflecting unemployment rates of all civilian workers by alternative seasonal adjustment methods 9
Press release No. 84-44 entitled "The Employment Situation: January 1984," Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor, February 3, 1984 11
Response to Representative Lungren's query regarding the seasonal adjustment figure for civilian employment from November 1982 33
Response to Representative Lungren's query regarding the number of States with double-digit unemployment figures in November 1982 35
Response to Representative Mitchell's query regarding persons who were at work part time for economic reasons and usually work full time 41
Tabular response to Senator Jepsen's request to supply for the record figures on the CPI and on unemployment 52

FRIDAY, MARCH 9, 1984

Norwood, Hon. Janet L., et al.:
Table reflecting unemployment rates of all civilian workers by alternative seasonal adjustment methods 60
Press release No. 84-102 entitled "The Employment Situation: February 1984," Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor, March 9, 1984.. 62

FRIDAY, APRIL 6, 1984

Norwood, Hon. Janet L., et al.:
Table reflecting unemployment rates of all civilian workers by alternative seasonal adjustment methods 95
Press release No. 84-145 entitled "The Employment Situation: March 1984," Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor, April 6, 1984 97

FRIDAY, MAY 4, 1984

Norwood, Hon. Janet L., et al.:
Table reflecting unemployment rates of all civilian workers by alternative seasonal adjustment methods 135
Press release No. 84-204 entitled "The Employment Situation: April 1984," Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor, May 4, 1984..... 137
Response to Senator Proxmire's query regarding the States with the most rapid improvement in their unemployment rate during the February 1983 to February 1984 period 165
Response to Senator Proxmire's query regarding the number of persons who have exhausted their regular, extended, and Federal supplemental unemployment benefits 166

FRIDAY, JUNE 1, 1984

Norwood, Hon. Janet L., et al.:
Table reflecting unemployment rates of all civilian workers by alternative seasonal adjustment methods 173
Press release No. 84-249 entitled "The Employment Situation: May 1984," Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor, June 4, 1984..... 175
Tabular response to Senator Proxmire's query to supply for the record the unemployment rates for the 10 largest States compared to those of January 1981 198

Page

Norwood, Hon. Janet L., et al.—Continued
Response to Senator Proxmire's query regarding the earnings of participants in summer jobs programs 202

EMPLOYMENT-UNEMPLOYMENT

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1984

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE,
Washington, DC.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:30 a.m., in room SR-235, Russell Senate Office Building, Hon. Roger W. Jepsen (chairman of the committee) presiding.

Present: Senators Jepsen, Abdnor, and Proxmire; and Representatives Mitchell, Obey, and Lungren.

Also present: James K. Galbraith, deputy director; Charles H. Bradford, assistant director; Robert R. Davis, Mary E. Eccles, Christopher J. Frenze, and Nathaniel W. Thomas, professional staff members.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR JEPSEN, CHAIRMAN

Senator JEPSEN. Madam Commissioner, it gives me great pleasure to welcome you once again before the Joint Economic Committee.

Today you bring us more good news on the employment situation, one that has been improving steadily since November 1982. The onflight economic recovery had been one of the best kept secrets in the country for a long time. According to the household survey, 249,000 jobs were created in January. I read in this morning's paper where the January retail sales were even greater than in December in many areas across the country, with major retailers. That, coupled with the 14.7-percent increase in the capital investment in the last quarter, is good news.

The economic recovery is strong and well balanced. Currently, we have a total civilian employment level of 103.2 million, a new record. More Americans are now working than ever before. Furthermore, the unemployment rate dropped again for the fifth month in a row. In January, the unemployment rates fell two-tenths of 1 percent, to a level of 8 percent. This improvement follows the sharp 2.5-percentage-point decline in the last 12 months of 1983. That's the biggest 12-month drop in over three decades.

What it all adds up to is the best recovery American workers have seen since World War II. Over 4 million jobs were created in the robust economic recovery that began 14 months ago. The December rise in the composite index of leading indicators points the way to continued economic expansion and job growth through 1984.

Unlike many periods of rapid economic growth, 1983 was a year of very low inflation. In 1983, consumer prices rose just 3.2 percent over the previous year. Between 1979 and 1982, inflation invisibly

robbed the American worker, reducing his paycheck and standard of living. But for the first time in 5 years, real average weekly earnings increased in 1983. The virtual defeat of inflation means American living standards are on the rise once again.

In summary, we have made great progress in the last year or so. Recession and inflation have been whipped, and unemployment is on the run. All indications are that we can look forward to another year of good, solid economic growth, and continued expansion of employment opportunities.

Let me add a special note of thanks to you and your staff for the assistance you provide regularly to this committee. I join other Americans in congratulating your Bureau on its centennial of service. The objectivity, consistency, and integrity of the BLS is beyond reproach.

At this time, I would ask if there are any members of the panel who have some opening statements, before we proceed with Ms. Norwood's report.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR PROXMIRE

Senator PROXMIRE. Mr. Chairman, I just have a very brief statement.

I agree with you that the unemployment picture certainly improved. The employment picture is improved. We do have a record number of people working, but it's not all that good as yet. The fact is that if we go from 1950 to 1981, those 31 years, that's the President's economic report, President Reagan's report, we find that there is only 1 year out of those 31 when unemployment was as high as it is today. We still have 9 million Americans out of work, and while there has been improvement, it's not nearly as bad as it was last November, 1 year ago last November and December. It's improved greatly. We still have a long, long way to go.

What bothers me very much is that in every recovery of the last four or five, it seems to me that the unemployment figures bottomed out at a very high level, which would mean that if it goes through this time, it could bottom out at 7½ percent or 7.4 percent, which would still be extraordinarily high by historical standards, particularly with the standards we've had in the last 30 years.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

OPENING STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE MITCHELL

Representative MITCHELL. Good to see you again, Ms. Norwood and friends.

I just wanted to make a brief comment. Two things jump out at me. First of all, I'm very, very happy about the reduction in unemployment. That makes good sense. But it disturbs me that we still have the historic pattern that has been maintained in this country for almost 40 years of a disproportionate amount of black and Hispanic unemployment. It still remains twice as high. Obviously, economic recovery doesn't mean much to those people who are out of work.

Second, I wanted to comment just a bit further on what Senator Proxmire said. For black youth, in particular, each time we've gone into a recession, we've gone in there with a higher rate than

before. The recession in the 1960's, I think the black youth unemployment rate was around 27 percent. The last one we went into, going into it, it had jumped from 28 percent to 40 percent. And if we have another, I would expect that the black youth rate of unemployment going into that recession would be higher than the present 50 percent where it is.

So when we get a chance to chat, I would certainly like to get your thinking on those two problem areas relating to blacks and other minorities.

OPENING STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE OBEY

Representative OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would simply say that I will virtually accept whatever improvements, small or otherwise which occur in this economy. I would simply make two observations. I suppose everyone views it through a prism of his own area. But in my district, I still have a good many counties where unemployment has been going up rather than down, over the last 3 months.

Second, it seems to me that a major question facing the country is still whether or not this recovery is sustainable for a long enough period of time and can actually prevent what Senator Proxmire is talking about—the gradual ratcheting up over time of the unemployment level. And in light of the appearances made before us earlier this week in the President's budget recommendation, it just seems to me that the major question is how this recovery from the deepest recession since the Great Depression, how this recovery can be sustained in light of those incredibly huge deficits.

Senator JEPSEN. I would like to believe that with the report that we have today, after the positive news for the last 14 months, that we could have PMA instead of what I call PNT, a positive mental attitude, instead of the power of negative thinking. If you choose to view things negatively long enough, sure enough, they will probably get worse. But we will keep the faith that things are continuing to get better, in spite of the gloom and doom.

Ms. Norwood, you may proceed, and I thank you for coming.

STATEMENT OF HON. JANET L. NORWOOD, COMMISSIONER, BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, ACCOMPANIED BY KENNETH V. DALTON, ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER, OFFICE OF PRICES AND LIVING CONDITIONS, AND THOMAS J. PLEWES, ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER, OFFICE OF EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT STATISTICS

Ms. NORWOOD. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Before I report on the unemployment situation for January 1984, I would like to point out that this report covers the first month of the Bureau of Labor Statistics' centennial year. Congress established the Bureau 100 years ago because there was an absence of reliable information about the labor force and other aspects of the economy. Over the past century, the Bureau, first as part of the Department of the Interior, later as an independent agency, and since 1913, as part of the Department of Labor, has established a tradition for reliability and objectivity.

As the Bureau's 10th Commissioner, I am very conscious of that tradition and of the responsibility that I have for maintaining it.

I brought with me this morning, Mr. Chairman, copies of a centennial statement that appeared in the January issue of our professional journal, the Monthly Labor Review. With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I propose inclusion of this statement in the record.

Senator JEPSEN. It will be entered in the record.

[The information referred to follows:]

CENTENNIAL

A century ago, in 1884, the Congress of the United States voted to establish a Bureau of Labor—later named the Bureau of Labor Statistics. This innovative act marked government's attempt to establish a permanent and independent agency to "collect information" on the earnings and working conditions of "laboring men and women." However, data-gathering was not a new Federal activity. The government had conducted studies and hearings on economic and social problems earlier, and had taken a decennial census since 1790. But these activities lacked continuity—even the census. After each census was completed, the staff was disbanded until the next decade. The 1890 census was actually completed under the direction of the first BLS commissioner, Carroll Wright. Founded almost 20 years before the Bureau of the Census was established in 1902 as a separate and continuing agency, the Bureau of Labor Statistics was thus a forerunner of a Federal statistical establishment that now includes a number of agencies in departments and commissions throughout government.

The act establishing the BLS was noteworthy in another way. It provided that the commissioner be appointed to a fixed 4-year term, unlike cabinet officers and other political appointees who served at the pleasure of the President. Thus, the BLS was assured of a measure of stability and independence that served its impartial and nonpolitical role during later periods of uncertainty and controversy. The appointment of Wright, who had headed the Massachusetts Bureau of Labor, as the first commissioner established the tradition that the commissioner should be a social scientist, and Wright's leadership made for the early professionalization of the Bureau's work.

A history of the BLS, written by Joseph P. Goldberg and William T. Moye, will be published later this year as part of the Bureau's centennial observance. Other special publications, conferences, and opportunities for Bureau staff and friends to mark the occasion appropriately are also being planned for the centennial year.

This history shows how the Bureau has grown and evolved in response to changing conditions and changes in BLS leadership. It is a social and economic history as well as the history of an institution. The major statistical programs conducted today by the BLS arose from clearly recognizable social needs. For example, during World War I the need to adjust wages in shipyards to rapidly rising prices led to the development of a cost-of-living measure that later became the Consumer Price Index (CPI). Today, the CPI is used not only to adjust wages under collective bargaining agreements, but also to adjust social security payments as well as private agreements ranging from divorce settlements to a variety of commercial transactions. It is hard to think of the economic life of the country being carried out today without a Consumer Price Index.

Similarly, during the depression of the 1930's, perhaps a fourth of the labor force was unemployed—but no one knows precisely what proportion because there were no adequate statistical surveys to gather data on unemployment. The need for better information to inform policymakers and the electorate and to assist in planning government programs led Congress in 1932 to increase the appropriation for BLS so that monthly data on hourly earnings and weekly hours could be collected from business establishments. Studies of industrial employment had been started by BLS in 1915 and had been gradually expanded. Today, payroll data on employment, hours, and earnings are gathered economy-wide under a cooperative Federal-State program covering 200,000 establishments and government. It was the depression, too, that led to the development of a

sophisticated household survey—conducted for BLS by the Census Bureau—that yields monthly data on employment and unemployment.

The spread of collective bargaining during the 1930's and 1940's increased demand for data on wage rates in different areas for different occupations, data on strikes, and data on characteristics of collective bargaining agreements. Programs dealing with productivity measurement, economic growth, and occupational projections, and with occupational safety and health were also responses to expressed needs.

A centennial should serve as a period of stock-taking—an opportunity to reflect on what we can learn from history and a time to think about emerging problems and their implications for the next hundred years. I have tried to identify some of the ideas and principles that have guided the BLS over its first century. They have not been codified or collected in any one place, but explicitly or implicitly they are repeatedly confirmed in the history of the BLS. They suggest what the BLS stands for:

* **A commitment to objectivity and fairness** in all of its data-gathering and interpretive and analytical work. Without this commitment—and public recognition of it—data will lack credibility and will lose its usefulness.

* **An insistence on candor at all times**—full disclosure of the methods employed in obtaining and analyzing the data, clear explanations of the limitations of the data, and a willingness to admit and correct errors should they occur.

* **Protection of confidentiality.** BLS assures its respondents that the information they provide will be kept confidential and used only for the purpose of statistical compilations. The willingness of employers to cooperate in BLS surveys is attributable in no small measure to the view that BLS can be trusted to protect its sources and handle the data professionally.

* **The pursuit of improvement**. Research at the Bureau means not only gathering information that will contribute to an understanding of economic and social trends, but it also means studying how to gather better information more efficiently and present it more effectively. Along with other agencies in and out of government, the Bureau has assiduously worked on problems of statistical methodology in order to improve the quality of information obtained for public purposes.

* **Willingness to change** Bureau programs to keep them relevant to changing economic and social conditions.

* Finally, **consistency**. The BLS cannot afford to have good days and bad days. It must maintain the highest standards of performance at all times.

In trying to live up to these ideals, the Bureau has been aided not only by the commitment of its staff but by the support of the Congress and successive secretaries of labor. Business and labor advisory committees have offered valuable counsel. The press, too, has been indispensable in disseminating the results of BLS surveys and special studies, and it has spoken up for the importance and independence of statistical research in government agencies.

President Chester Arthur signed the bill creating the Bureau on June 27, 1884. The first commissioner, Carroll Wright, took office in January 1885. As we enter our centennial year, we are heartened by the record of the Bureau's first 100 years and determined to sustain the Bureau's commitment for a second century.

January 1984

Janet L. Norwood
Commissioner of Labor Statistics

Ms. NORWOOD. Now I'm very pleased to make a few comments to supplement our employment situation press release issued this morning.

The employment situation showed further improvement in January. After adjustment for seasonality, unemployment continued its downward trend, and both of the Bureau's major surveys showed further gains in employment. The overall jobless rate, which includes the resident Armed Forces in the labor force, was 7.9 percent in January, and the civilian worker rate was 8 percent. Both were down from December and are at the lowest recorded since October 1981.

Data for January are strongly affected by seasonal movements. Sizable job losses typically occur from December to January, as employment in the goods-producing sector, especially construction, is affected by winter weather, and employment in the service sector, especially in retail trade, is cut back from the expanded holiday activity.

Total civilian employment, as measured by the household survey, declined less than usual in January. After seasonal adjustment, total employment was up by 250,000 over the month, somewhat less than the average monthly increase of 350,000 from September to December. Since the recession trough in November 1982, civilian employment has increased by 4.2 million. Most of the job gain was among adult men—2.5 million. Employment among adult women has risen by 1.7 million since November 1982.

Payroll employment, as measured by the business survey, was up by 285,000 after seasonal adjustment. The over-the-month advance was led by an increase of 200,000 in the goods-producing sector, about equally divided between construction and manufacturing. Factory jobs expanded in machinery, electrical equipment, automobiles, and rubber, and plastics, all of which have rebounded strongly during the recovery. Manufacturing employment has risen by nearly 1.2 million since the November 1982 recession trough but it is still about 1 million below the July 1981 prerecession peak and 1.8 million under the 1979 alltime high.

With the exception of Government, over-the-month job gains occurred throughout the service-producing sector—after allowance is made for seasonal movements. Employment in the services industry rose by 40,000 in January, continuing the steady growth over the recovery period. The services industry has contributed about one in every three new jobs created since November 1982.

The increase in business activity in January was also evident in the hours of work figures. Factory hours usually decline sharply in January. This year, however, employers cut hours back less than usual. After seasonal adjustment, the factory workweek was up by 0.4 hour. Factory overtime hours, which are at their highest level since 1979, were unchanged in January. Further evidence of continued labor-market strength is provided by the BLS diffusion index, which shows two-thirds of its 186 private nonagricultural industries registering employment gains in January.

The number of unemployed persons was 9 million, seasonally adjusted, in January, nearly 3 million below the 1982 recession peak level. As in December, the January decline was concentrated among workers who had been permanently separated from their

former jobs. There was little over-the-month change in the other unemployment categories—that is, persons on layoff, those who had voluntarily left their last job, or those who were entering or reentering the work force.

A comparison of the current recovery with that following the severe 1973–75 recession highlights the vigor of labor market developments since the end of 1982. Employment has grown as rapidly in the current recovery period, and unemployment has declined much more sharply. Overall joblessness in the current recovery had in fact declined at twice the rate of 1975–76, with all major worker groups showing greater improvement than in the earlier period. One noteworthy difference between the two periods is that labor force growth is significantly less now than it was in the late 1970's. As we have discussed before, demographic factors account for much of this change. In the 14 months since the end of the recession in November 1982, the civilian labor force has grown by only 1.3 million. This compares with an increase of 2.7 million during the same period after the 1975 recession low. In the past 14 months, the women's labor force has increased by 900,000, and the number of teenagers has declined by 550,000. In contrast, in the 14 months after March 1975, the number of teenagers actually rose by 320,000, and almost 1.5 million women entered the labor force.

In summary, the employment situation continued to improve in January. Employment continued to move upward, and the unemployment rate continued its steady decline.

NEW BLS STATISTICAL SERIES

Mr. Chairman, it has been my custom to alert the Joint Economic Committee to important changes in statistical series. I would like to call the committee's attention to an important statistical milestone. More than 10 years ago, the Bureau of Labor Statistics began measuring price changes of goods in foreign trade. We have been publishing these data since 1971, but our coverage of imports and exports has been only partial. A year ago, we began publishing the first U.S. import price index covering all goods purchased abroad. We have now also completed a U.S. export price index covering all U.S. goods sold to other countries. We will release this new index for the first time next Wednesday, February 8. We believe that the two new price indexes will permit more accurate measurement of U.S. trade balances.

Mr. Dalton, on my right, Mr. Plewes, on my left, and I would be glad to try to answer questions you may have.

[The table attached to Ms. Norwood's statement, together with press release referred to, follows:]

UNEMPLOYMENT RATES OF ALL CIVILIAN WORKERS BY ALTERNATIVE SEASONAL ADJUSTMENT METHODS

Month and year	Unadjusted rate	X-11 ARIMA method					X-11 method (official method before 1980)	Range (cols. 2–7)
		Official procedure	Concurrent	Stable	Total	Residual		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
1983								
January	11.4	10.4	10.4	10.3	10.5	10.6	10.4	0.3
February	11.3	10.4	10.4	10.2	10.5	10.6	10.4	.4
March	10.8	10.3	10.3	10.2	10.4	10.4	10.3	.2
April	10.0	10.2	10.2	10.2	10.3	10.2	10.3	.1
May	9.8	10.1	10.1	10.2	10.1	10.1	10.1	.1
June	10.2	10.0	10.0	10.0	9.8	10.0	10.0	.2
July	9.4	9.5	9.5	9.4	9.5	9.5	9.5	.1
August	9.2	9.5	9.5	9.4	9.5	9.5	9.5	.1
September	8.8	9.2	9.2	9.2	9.2	9.1	9.3	.2
October	8.4	8.8	8.8	9.0	8.8	8.8	8.9	.2
November	8.1	8.4	8.4	8.5	8.4	8.4	8.4	.1
December	8.0	8.2	8.2	8.4	8.2	8.2	8.2	.2
1984								
January	8.8	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.1	8.0	8.0	.1

Explanation of Column Heads

(1) Unadjusted rate. Unemployment rate for all civilian workers, not seasonally adjusted.

(2) Official procedure (X-11 ARIMA method). The published seasonally adjusted rate for all civilian workers. Each of the 3 major civilian labor force components—agricultural employment, nonagricultural employment and unemployment—for 4 age-sex groups—males and females, ages 16–19 and 20 years and over—are seasonally adjusted independently using data from January 1974 forward. The data series for each of these 12 components are extended by a year at each end of the original series using ARIMA (Auto-Regressive, Integrated, Moving Average) models chosen specifically for each series. Each extended series is then seasonally adjusted with the X-11 portion of the X-11 ARIMA program. The 4 teenage unemployment and nonagricultural employment components are adjusted with the additive adjustment model, while the other components are adjusted with the multiplicative model. The unemployment rate is computed by summing the 4 seasonally adjusted unemployment components and calculating that total as a percent of the civilian labor force total derived by summing all 12 seasonally adjusted components. All the seasonally adjusted series are revised at the end of each year. Extrapolated factors for January-June are computed at the beginning of each year; extrapolated factors for July-December are computed in the middle of the year after the June data become available. Each set of 6-month factors are published in advance, in the January and July issues, respectively, of Employment and Earnings.

(3) Concurrent (X-11 ARIMA method). The official procedure for computation of the rate for all civilian workers using the 12 components is followed except that extrapolated factors are not used at all. Each component is seasonally adjusted with the X-11 ARIMA program each month as the most recent data become available. Rates for each month of the current year are shown as first computed; they are revised only once each year, at the end of the year when data for the full year become available. For example, the rate for January 1984 would be based, during 1984, on the adjustment of data from the period January 1974 through January 1984.

(4) Stable (X-11 ARIMA method). Each of the 12 civilian labor force components is extended using ARIMA models as in the official procedure and then run through the X-11 part of the program using the stable option. This option assumes that seasonal patterns are basically constant from year-to-year and computes final seasonal factors as unweighted averages of all the seasonal-irregular components for each month across the entire span of the period adjusted. As in the official procedure,

factors are extrapolated in 6-month intervals and the series are revised at the end of each year. The procedure for computation of the rate from the seasonally adjusted components is also identical to the official procedure.

(5) Total (X-11 ARIMA method). This is one alternative aggregation procedure, in which total unemployment and civilian labor force levels are extended with ARIMA models and directly adjusted with multiplicative adjustment models in the X-11 part of the program. The rate is computed by taking seasonally adjusted total unemployment as a percent of seasonally adjusted total civilian labor force. Factors are extrapolated in 6-month intervals and the series revised at the end of each year.

(6) Residual (X-11 ARIMA method). This is another alternative aggregation method, in which total civilian employment and civilian labor force levels are extended using ARIMA models and then directly adjusted with multiplicative adjustment models. The seasonally adjusted unemployment level is derived by subtracting seasonally adjusted employment from seasonally adjusted labor force. The rate is then computed by taking the derived unemployment level as a percent of the labor force level. Factors are extrapolated in 6-month intervals and the series revised at the end of each year.

(7) X-11 method (official method before 1980). The method for computation of the official procedure is used except that the series are not extended with ARIMA models and the factors are projected in 12-month intervals. The standard X-11 program is used to perform the seasonal adjustment.

Methods of Adjustment: The X-11 ARIMA method was developed at Statistics Canada by the Seasonal Adjustment and Times Series Staff under the direction of Estela Bee Dagum. The method is described in "The X-11 ARIMA Seasonal Adjustment Method," by Estela Bee Dagum, Statistics Canada Catalogue No. 12-564E, February 1980.

The standard X-11 method is described in "X-11 Variant of the Census Method II Seasonal Adjustment Program," by Julius Shiskin, Allan Young and John Musgrave (Technical Paper No. 15, Bureau of the Census, 1967).

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, February 1984.

News United States Department of Labor

Bureau of Labor Statistics Washington, D.C. 20212

Technical information: (202) 523-1944
523-1371
523-1959
Media contact: 523-1913

USDL 84-44
TRANSMISSION OF MATERIAL IN THIS RELEASE IS EMBARGOED UNTIL 8:30 A.M. (EST), FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1984

THE EMPLOYMENT SITUATION: JANUARY 1984

The employment situation continued to improve in January, the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U.S. Department of Labor reported today. Both the overall unemployment rate, at 7.9 percent, and the rate for civilian workers, at 8.0 percent, were down two-tenths of a percentage point from December, sustaining the decline that has totaled 2.7 percentage points since the 1982 recession high.

The number of employees on nonagricultural payrolls--as measured by the monthly survey of establishments--rose by 285,000, seasonally adjusted, to 91.9 million in January. Total civilian employment--as measured by the monthly survey of households--also continued the advance which has totaled more than 4 million since November 1982. The factory workweek rose four-tenths of an hour to 40.9 hours in January.

Unemployment (Household Survey Data)

The civilian unemployment rate continued its downward trend from the November 1982 recession trough of 10.7 percent to 8.0 percent in January, seasonally adjusted. The number of jobless persons declined by 2.9 million over the same time period to 9.0 million. Significant drops in unemployment were recorded for all major demographic groups except black youth. January unemployment rates were 7.3 and 7.1 percent for adult men and women, respectively, and 19.4 percent for teenagers. The unemployment rate for whites edged down from 7.1 to 6.9 percent, while the rate for black workers declined from 17.8 to 16.7 percent. However, the jobless rate for black teenagers held close to 50 percent. (See tables A-2 and A-3.)

The number of unemployed persons who had lost their last job declined by 190,000 in January to 4.8 million. There was little change in the number of unemployed who had left their last job or were labor force entrants. The number of persons in the short-term (less than 5 weeks) and long-term (15 weeks and over) categories continued to trend down, and the median duration of unemployment was little changed at 9.2 weeks. (See tables A-8 and A-7.)

Civilian Employment and the Labor Force (Household Survey Data)

Civilian employment continued to rise in January but at a slower pace than in the prior 2 months. Adult men experienced a substantial employment gain, while employment of adult women and teenagers was about unchanged. At 103.2 million (seasonally adjusted), total employment has advanced by 4.2 million since November 1982.

The civilian labor force totaled 112.2 million in January, virtually unchanged over the month. Since January 1983, the labor force has grown by more than 1.2 million; the number of adult men and women has risen by 900,000 and 700,000, respectively, while there was a 350,000 reduction in the teenage labor force. (See table A-2.)

Industry Payroll Employment (Establishment Survey Data)

Total nonagricultural payroll employment rose by 285,000 in January to 91.9 million, after adjustment for seasonality. Since November 1982, total nonfarm employment has grown by 3.1 million. (See table B-1.)

January employment gains were widespread, although the bulk of the increase took place in construction and manufacturing. Construction employment declined less than it usually does from December to January and, after adjustment, rose by 100,000; with this increase, construction

jobs exceeded their March 1983 recessionary low by nearly 450,000. Strong recovery continued in manufacturing, with employment up by 100,000. Job gains continued in machinery, electrical equipment, automobiles, and rubber and plastics, all of which have shown strength in recent months.

Employment in the services industry rose by 40,000, continuing the growth that has totaled nearly a million since November 1982. The large seasonal job decline in retail trade was somewhat less than usually occurs in January, and, after seasonal adjustment, employment rose by 35,000. More than half of the over-the-month increase of 25,000 in transportation and public utilities represented a return of striking workers to their jobs. There were also small employment increases in wholesale trade and finance, insurance, and real estate.

Weekly Hours (Establishment Survey Data)

The average workweek of production or nonsupervisory workers on private nonagricultural payrolls rose 0.3 hour in January to 35.6 hours, seasonally adjusted, the highest level since

Table A. Major indicators of labor market activity, seasonally adjusted

Category	Quarterly averages			Monthly data			Dec.-Jan. change
	1982	1983		1983		1984	
	IV	III	IV	Nov.	Dec.	Jan.	
HOUSEHOLD DATA							
	Thousands of persons						
Labor force 1/	112,493	113,737	113,702	113,720	113,824	113,901	77
Total employment 1/	100,718	103,209	104,195	104,291	104,629	104,876	247
Civilian labor force	110,829	112,057	112,012	112,035	112,136	112,215	79
Civilian employment	99,054	101,528	102,506	102,606	102,941	103,190	249
Unemployment	11,775	10,529	9,507	9,429	9,195	9,026	-169
Not in labor force	62,217	62,392	62,938	62,916	62,985	63,318	333
Discouraged workers	1,813	1,610	1,457	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
	Percent of labor force						
Unemployment rates:							
All workers 1/	10.5	9.3	8.4	8.3	8.1	7.9	-0.2
All civilian workers	10.6	9.4	8.5	8.4	8.2	8.0	-0.2
Adult men	9.9	8.7	7.8	7.8	7.4	7.3	-0.1
Adult women	9.0	7.9	7.2	7.2	7.1	7.1	0
Teenagers	24.1	22.4	20.6	20.2	20.1	19.4	-0.7
White	9.5	8.1	7.4	7.3	7.1	6.9	-0.2
Black	20.6	19.4	17.9	17.7	17.8	16.7	-1.1
Hispanic origin	15.3	12.8	12.1	12.3	11.6	11.2	-0.4
ESTABLISHMENT DATA							
	Thousands of jobs						
Nonfarm payroll employment	88,796	90,250	91,341p	91,355	91,583p	91,870p	287p
Goods-producing industries	23,160	23,830	24,297p	24,311	24,412p	24,612p	200p
Service-producing industries	65,636	66,421	67,044p	67,044	67,171p	67,258p	87p
	Hours of work						
Average weekly hours:							
Total private nonfarm	34.7	35.1	35.3p	35.2	35.3p	35.6p	0.3p
Manufacturing	39.0	40.4	40.6p	40.6	40.5p	40.9p	0.4p
Manufacturing overtime	2.3	3.1	3.3p	3.3	3.4p	3.4p	0p

1/ Includes the resident Armed Forces.
p=preliminary.
N.A.=not available.

January 1980. Weekly hours in manufacturing were up by 0.4 hour to 40.9 hours, while factory overtime remained at December's high level of 3.4 hours. (See table B-2.)

The index of aggregate weekly hours of production or nonsupervisory workers on private nonagricultural payrolls rose by 1.3 percent in January to 110.2 (1977=100). The manufacturing index was up 1.6 percent to 95.5 and was 14.9 percent above the December 1982 low. (See table B-5.)

Hourly and Weekly Earnings (Establishment Survey Data)

Average hourly earnings increased by 0.6 percent in January, seasonally adjusted, while weekly earnings rose by 1.5 percent. Before adjustment for seasonality, average hourly earnings, at $8.24, were up 9 cents over the month and 34 cents over the year. Weekly earnings were about unchanged over the month at $289.22 but were $15.88 above a year earlier. (See table B-3.)

The Hourly Earnings Index (Establishment Survey Data)

The Hourly Earnings Index (HEI) was 158.2 (1977=100) in January, seasonally adjusted, an increase of 0.5 percent from December. For the 12 months ended in January, the increase (before seasonal adjustment) was 3.6 percent. The HEI excludes the effects of two types of changes unrelated to underlying wage rate movements--fluctuations in overtime in manufacturing, and interindustry employment shifts. In dollars of constant purchasing power, the HEI increased 0.4 percent during the 12-month period ended in December. (See table B-4.)

Expanded Industry Detail for the Service Sector

The establishment data tables have been expanded to include additional industry detail, particularly for the service-producing sector, but also for several industries within the goods-producing sector as well. Most of the added data appear in table B-1.

Explanatory Note

This news release presents statistics from two major surveys, the Current Population Survey (household survey) and the Current Employment Statistics Survey (establishment survey). The household survey provides the information on the labor force, total employment, and unemployment that appears in the A tables, marked HOUSEHOLD DATA. It is a sample survey of about 60,000 households that is conducted by the Bureau of the Census with most of the findings analyzed and published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS).

The establishment survey provides the information on the employment, hours, and earnings of workers on nonagricultural payrolls that appears in the B tables, marked ESTABLISHMENT DATA. This information is collected from payroll records by BLS in cooperation with State agencies. The sample includes approximately 189,000 establishments employing about 36 million people.

For both surveys, the data for a given month are actually collected for and relate to a particular week. In the household survey, unless otherwise indicated, it is the calendar week that contains the 12th day of the month, which is called the survey week. In the establishment survey, the reference week is the pay period including the 12th, which may or may not correspond directly to the calendar week.

The data in this release are affected by a number of technical factors, including definitions, survey differences, seasonal adjustments, and the inevitable variance in results between a survey of a sample and a census of the entire population. Each of these factors is explained below.

Coverage, definitions and differences between surveys

The sample households in the household survey are selected so as to reflect the entire civilian noninstitutional population 16 years of age and older. Each person in a household is classified as employed, unemployed, or not in the labor force. Those who hold more than one job are classified according to the job at which they worked the most hours.

People are classified as *employed* if they did any work at all as paid civilians; worked in their own business or profession or on their own farm; or worked 15 hours or more in an enterprise operated by a member of their family, whether they were paid or not. People are also counted as employed if they were on unpaid leave because of illness, bad weather, disputes between labor and management, or personal reasons. Members of the Armed Forces stationed in the United States are also included in the employed total.

People are classified as *unemployed*, regardless of their eligibility for unemployment benefits or public assistance, if they meet all of the following criteria: They had no employment during the survey week; they were available for work at that time; and they made specific efforts to find employment sometime during the prior 4 weeks. Also included among the unemployed are persons not looking for work because they were laid off and waiting to be recalled and those expecting to report to a job within 30 days.

The *labor force* equals the sum of the number employed and the number unemployed. The *unemployment rate* is the percentage of unemployed people in the labor force (civilian plus the resident Armed Forces). Table A-5 presents a special grouping of seven measures of unemployment based on varying definitions of unemployment and the labor force. The definitions are provided in the table. The most restrictive definition yields U-1, and the most comprehensive yields U-7. The overall unemployment rate is U-5a, while U-5b represents the same measure with a civilian labor force base.

Unlike the household survey, the establishment survey only counts wage and salary employees whose names appear on the payroll records of nonagricultural firms. As a result, there are many differences between the two surveys, among which are the following:

----The household survey, although based on a smaller sample, reflects a larger segment of the population; the establishment survey excludes agriculture, the self-employed, unpaid family workers, private household workers, and members of the resident Armed Forces;

----The household survey includes people on unpaid leave among the employed; the establishment survey does not;

----The household survey is limited to those 16 years of age and older; the establishment survey is not limited by age;

----The household survey has no duplication of individuals, because each individual is counted only once; in the establishment survey, employees working at more than one job or otherwise appearing on more than one payroll would be counted separately for each appearance.

Other differences between the two surveys are described in "Comparing Employment Estimates from Household and Payroll Surveys," which may be obtained from the BLS upon request.

Seasonal adjustment

Over a course of a year, the size of the Nation's labor force and the levels of employment and unemployment undergo sharp fluctuations due to such seasonal events as changes in weather, reduced or expanded production, harvests, major holidays, and the opening and closing of schools. For example, the labor force increases by a large number each June, when schools close and many young people enter the job market. The effect of such seasonal variation can be very large; over the course of a year, for example, seasonality may account for as much as 95 percent of the month-to-month changes in unemployment.

Because these seasonal events follow a more or less regular pattern each year, their influence on statistical trends can be eliminated by adjusting the statistics from month to month. These adjustments make nonseasonal developments, such as declines in economic activity or increases in the participation of women in the labor force, easier to spot. To return to the school's-out example, the large number of people entering the labor force each June is likely to obscure any other changes that have taken place since May, making it difficult to determine if the level of economic activity has risen or declined. However, because the effect of students finishing school in previous years is known, the statistics for the current year can be adjusted to allow for a comparable change. Insofar as the seasonal adjustment is made correctly, the adjusted figure provides a more useful tool with which to analyze changes in economic activity.

Measures of labor force, employment, and unemployment contain components such as age and sex. Statistics for all

employees, production workers, average weekly hours, and average hourly earnings include components based on the employer's industry. All these statistics can be seasonally adjusted either by adjusting the total or by adjusting each of the components and combining them. The second procedure usually yields more accurate information and is therefore followed by BLS. For example, the seasonally adjusted figure for the labor force is the sum of eight seasonally adjusted civilian employment components, plus the resident Armed Forces total (not adjusted for seasonality), and four seasonally adjusted unemployment components; the total for unemployment is the sum of the four unemployment components; and the overall unemployment rate is derived by dividing the resulting estimate of total unemployment by the estimate of the labor force.

The numerical factors used to make the seasonal adjustments are recalculated regularly. For the household survey, the factors are calculated for the January-June period and again for the July-December period. The January revision is applied to data that have been published over the previous 5 years. For the establishment survey, updated factors for seasonal adjustment are calculated only once a year, along with the introduction of new benchmarks which are discussed at the end of the next section.

Sampling variability

Statistics based on the household and establishment surveys are subject to sampling error, that is, the estimate of the number of people employed and the other estimates drawn from these surveys probably differ from the figures that would be obtained from a complete census, even if the same questionnaires and procedures were used. In the household survey, the amount of the differences can be expressed in terms of standard errors. The numerical value of a standard error depends upon the size of the sample, the results of the survey, and other factors. However, the numerical value is always such that the chances are 68 out of 100 that an estimate based on the sample will differ by no more than the standard error from the results of a complete census. The chances are 90 out of 100 that an estimate based on the sample will differ by no more than 1.6 times the standard error from the results of a complete census. At the 90-percent level of confidence--the confidence limits used by BLS in its analyses--the error for the monthly change in total employment is on the order of plus or minus 335,000; for total unemployment it is 240,000; and, for the overall unemployment rate, it is 0.21 percentage point. These figures do not mean that the sample results are off by these magnitudes but, rather, that the chances are 90 out of 100 that the "true" level or rate would not be expected to differ from the estimates by more than these amounts.

Sampling errors for monthly surveys are reduced when the data are cumulated for several months, such as quarterly or annually. Also, as a general rule, the smaller the estimate, the larger the sampling error. Therefore, relatively speaking, the estimate of the size of the labor force is subject to less error than is the estimate of the number unemployed. And, among the unemployed, the sampling error for the jobless rate of adult men, for example, is much smaller than is the error for the jobless rate of teenagers. Specifically, the error on monthly change in the jobless rate for men is .29 percentage point; for teenagers, it is 1.28 percentage points.

In the establishment survey, estimates for the 2 most current months are based on incomplete returns; for this reason, these estimates are labeled preliminary in the tables. When all the returns in the sample have been received, the estimates are revised. In other words, data for the month of September are published in preliminary form in October and November and in final form in December. To remove errors that build up over time, a comprehensive count of the employed is conducted each year. The results of this survey are used to establish new benchmarks—comprehensive counts of employment—against which month-to-month changes can be measured. The new benchmarks also incorporate changes in the classification of industries and allow for the formation of new establishments.

Additional statistics and other information

In order to provide a broad view of the Nation's employment situation, BLS regularly publishes a wide variety of data in this news release. More comprehensive statistics are contained in *Employment and Earnings*, published each month by BLS. It is available for $6.00 per issue or $39.00 per year from the U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20204. A check or money order made out to the Superintendent of Documents must accompany all orders.

Employment and Earnings also provides approximations of the standard errors for the household survey data published in this release. For unemployment and other labor force categories, the standard errors appear in tables B through J of its "Explanatory Notes." Measures of the reliability of the data drawn from the establishment survey and the actual amounts of revision due to benchmark adjustments are provided in tables M, O, P, and Q of that publication.

HOUSEHOLD DATA

Table A-1. Employment status of the population, including Armed Forces in the United States, by sex

(Numbers in thousands)

Employment status and sex	Not seasonally adjusted			Seasonally adjusted[1]					
	Jan. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984	Jan. 1983	Sept. 1983	Oct. 1983	Nov. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984
TOTAL									
Noninstitutional population[2]	175,021	176,809	177,219	175,021	176,297	176,474	176,636	176,809	177,219
Labor force[3]	111,446	113,483	112,711	112,344	113,924	113,561	113,720	113,824	113,901
Participation rate[4]	63.7	64.2	63.6	64.2	64.6	64.3	64.4	64.4	64.3
Total employed[5]	98,929	104,491	102,656	106,021	103,571	103,665	104,291	104,629	104,676
Employment-population ratio[6]	56.5	59.1	58.1	57.6	58.7	58.7	59.0	59.2	59.2
Resident Armed Forces	1,667	1,688	1,686	1,667	1,695	1,695	1,685	1,688	1,686
Civilian employed	97,262	102,803	101,273	99,154	101,876	101,970	102,606	102,941	103,190
Agriculture	2,921	2,950	2,807	3,420	3,308	3,240	3,257	3,356	3,271
Nonagricultural industries	94,341	99,852	98,463	95,734	98,568	98,730	99,349	99,585	99,918
Unemployed	12,517	8,992	9,755	11,523	10,353	9,896	9,429	9,195	9,026
Unemployment rate[7]	11.2	7.9	8.7	10.3	9.1	8.7	8.3	8.1	7.9
Not in labor force	63,575	63,326	64,508	62,677	62,373	62,913	62,916	62,985	63,318
Men, 16 years and over									
Noninstitutional population[2]	83,652	84,506	84,745	83,652	84,261	84,346	84,423	84,506	84,745
Labor force[3]	63,487	64,406	64,169	64,017	64,877	64,709	64,806	64,838	64,930
Participation rate[4]	75.9	76.2	75.7	76.5	77.0	76.7	76.8	76.7	76.6
Total employed[5]	55,935	59,996	58,372	57,334	58,820	58,950	59,389	59,580	59,781
Employment-population ratio[6]	66.9	69.9	68.9	68.5	69.8	69.9	70.3	70.5	70.5
Resident Armed Forces	1,531	1,537	1,542	1,531	1,549	1,543	1,534	1,537	1,542
Civilian employed	54,404	57,559	56,830	55,803	57,279	57,407	57,855	58,043	58,239
Unemployed	7,552	5,310	5,797	6,683	6,049	5,759	5,457	5,258	5,149
Unemployment rate[7]	11.9	8.2	9.0	10.4	9.3	8.9	8.4	8.1	7.9
Women, 16 years and over									
Noninstitutional population[2]	91,369	92,302	92,474	91,369	92,036	92,129	92,214	92,302	92,474
Labor force[3]	47,959	49,077	48,542	48,327	49,047	48,852	48,914	48,986	48,971
Participation rate[4]	52.5	53.2	52.5	52.9	53.3	53.0	53.0	53.1	53.0
Total employed[5]	42,994	45,395	44,284	43,687	44,743	44,715	44,902	45,049	45,094
Employment-population ratio[6]	47.1	49.2	48.2	47.6	48.6	48.5	48.7	48.8	48.8
Resident Armed Forces	136	151	144	136	146	152	151	151	144
Civilian employed	42,858	45,244	44,140	43,551	44,597	44,563	44,751	44,898	44,950
Unemployed	4,965	3,683	3,958	4,640	4,304	4,137	3,972	3,937	3,876
Unemployment rate[7]	10.4	7.5	8.2	10.0	8.8	8.5	8.1	8.0	7.9

[1] The population and Armed Forces figures are not adjusted for seasonal variation; therefore, identical numbers appear in the unadjusted and seasonally adjusted columns.

[2] Includes members of the Armed Forces stationed in the United States.

[3] Labor force as a percent of the noninstitutional population.

[4] Total employment as a percent of the noninstitutional population.

[5] Unemployment as a percent of the labor force (including the resident Armed Forces).

Table A-2. Employment status of the civilian population by sex and age

(Numbers in thousands)

Employment status, sex, and age	Not seasonally adjusted			Seasonally adjusted[1]					
	Jan. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984	Jan. 1983	Sept. 1983	Oct. 1983	Nov. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984
TOTAL									
Civilian noninstitutional population	173,354	175,121	175,533	173,354	174,602	174,779	174,951	175,121	175,533
Civilian labor force	109,779	111,795	111,025	110,677	112,229	111,866	112,035	112,136	112,215
Participation rate	63.3	63.8	63.3	63.8	64.3	64.0	64.0	64.0	63.9
Employed	97,262	102,803	101,270	99,154	101,876	101,970	102,606	102,961	103,190
Employment-population ratio[2]	56.1	58.7	57.7	57.2	58.3	58.3	58.6	58.8	58.8
Unemployed	12,517	8,992	9,755	11,523	10,353	9,896	9,429	9,195	9,026
Unemployment rate	11.4	8.0	8.8	10.4	9.2	8.8	8.4	8.2	8.0
Men, 20 years and over									
Civilian noninstitutional population	74,339	75,433	75,692	74,339	75,115	75,216	75,327	75,433	75,692
Civilian labor force	58,009	58,915	58,924	58,131	59,012	58,989	59,053	59,050	59,299
Participation rate	78.0	78.1	77.8	78.2	78.6	78.4	78.4	78.3	78.3
Employed	51,529	54,452	53,983	52,508	53,947	54,140	54,457	54,658	54,999
Employment-population ratio[2]	69.3	72.2	71.3	70.6	71.8	72.0	72.3	72.5	72.7
Agriculture	2,203	2,188	2,130	2,436	2,431	2,376	2,336	2,379	2,356
Nonagricultural industries	49,325	52,265	51,853	50,072	51,516	51,764	52,121	52,284	52,643
Unemployed	6,481	4,463	4,941	5,623	5,065	4,849	4,596	4,392	4,300
Unemployment rate	11.2	7.6	8.4	9.7	8.6	8.2	7.8	7.4	7.3
Women, 20 years and over									
Civilian noninstitutional population	83,490	84,666	84,860	83,490	84,333	84,443	84,553	84,666	84,860
Civilian labor force	44,198	45,246	44,883	44,234	45,062	44,936	44,953	45,024	44,981
Participation rate	52.9	53.4	52.9	53.0	53.4	53.2	53.2	53.2	53.0
Employed	40,024	42,191	41,548	40,255	41,550	41,570	41,738	41,843	41,798
Employment-population ratio[2]	47.9	49.8	49.0	48.2	49.3	49.2	49.4	49.4	49.3
Agriculture	498	554	498	617	581	597	638	653	625
Nonagricultural industries	39,536	41,637	41,050	39,638	40,969	40,973	41,100	41,190	41,174
Unemployed	4,173	3,055	3,335	3,979	3,512	3,366	3,215	3,181	3,182
Unemployment rate	9.4	6.8	7.4	9.0	7.8	7.5	7.2	7.1	7.1
Both sexes, 16 to 19 years									
Civilian noninstitutional population	15,525	15,022	14,981	15,525	15,154	15,120	15,072	15,022	14,981
Civilian labor force	7,572	7,633	7,218	8,312	8,155	7,981	8,029	8,062	7,935
Participation rate	48.8	50.8	48.2	53.5	53.8	52.8	53.3	53.7	53.0
Employed	5,709	6,159	5,729	6,391	6,379	6,260	6,411	6,440	6,392
Employment-population ratio[2]	36.8	41.0	38.3	41.2	42.1	41.4	42.5	42.9	42.7
Agriculture	228	289	179	367	396	367	383	329	298
Nonagricultural industries	5,482	5,951	5,560	6,024	6,003	5,913	6,128	6,111	6,102
Unemployed	1,863	1,474	1,479	1,921	1,776	1,721	1,618	1,622	1,543
Unemployment rate	24.6	19.3	20.5	23.1	21.8	21.6	20.2	20.1	19.4

[1] The population figures are not adjusted for seasonal variation; therefore, identical numbers appear in the unadjusted and seasonally adjusted columns.

[2] Civilian employment as a percent of the civilian noninstitutional population.

HOUSEHOLD DATA

Table A-3. Employment status of the civilian population by race, sex, age, and Hispanic origin

(Numbers in thousands)

Employment status, race, sex, age, and Hispanic origin	Not seasonally adjusted			Seasonally adjusted[1]					
	Jan. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984	Jan. 1983	Sept. 1983	Oct. 1983	Nov. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984
WHITE									
Civilian noninstitutional population	150,129	151,484	151,939	150,129	151,021	151,175	151,324	151,486	151,939
Civilian labor force	95,533	97,352	96,767	96,287	97,507	97,330	97,559	97,724	97,813
Participation rate	63.6	64.3	63.7	64.1	64.6	64.4	64.5	64.5	64.4
Employed	85,760	90,628	89,268	87,481	89,693	89,851	90,430	90,779	91,044
Employment-population ratio[2]	57.1	59.8	58.8	58.3	59.4	59.4	59.8	59.9	59.9
Unemployed	9,772	6,724	7,499	8,806	7,814	7,480	7,129	6,945	6,768
Unemployment rate	10.2	6.9	7.7	9.1	8.0	7.7	7.3	7.1	6.9
Men, 20 years and over									
Civilian labor force	51,352	51,854	51,939	51,138	51,881	51,902	52,021	52,063	52,270
Participation rate	78.4	78.6	78.3	78.6	79.0	78.9	78.9	78.9	78.8
Employed	45,910	48,387	48,038	46,795	47,908	48,128	48,414	48,589	48,964
Employment-population ratio[2]	70.5	73.3	72.4	71.9	72.9	73.1	73.5	73.6	73.8
Unemployed	5,442	3,468	3,900	4,343	3,973	3,774	3,607	3,474	3,306
Unemployment rate	10.6	6.7	7.5	8.5	7.7	7.3	6.9	6.7	6.3
Women, 20 years and over									
Civilian labor force	37,763	38,754	38,618	37,805	38,463	38,438	38,489	38,556	38,585
Participation rate	52.3	53.0	52.4	52.4	52.8	52.7	52.7	52.8	52.6
Employed	34,625	36,593	35,963	34,832	35,928	36,016	36,177	36,292	36,180
Employment-population ratio[2]	48.0	50.1	49.1	48.3	49.3	49.4	49.6	49.7	49.4
Unemployed	3,138	2,162	2,655	2,973	2,540	2,422	2,312	2,264	2,325
Unemployment rate	8.3	5.6	6.9	7.9	6.6	6.3	6.0	5.9	6.0
Both sexes, 16 to 19 years									
Civilian labor force	6,717	6,744	6,410	7,344	7,158	6,999	7,049	7,105	7,038
Participation rate	52.2	50.3	51.9	57.1	57.3	56.4	56.7	57.2	56.9
Employed	5,225	5,649	5,271	5,854	5,857	5,707	5,839	5,898	5,900
Employment-population ratio[2]	40.6	45.5	42.6	45.5	46.9	45.8	47.0	47.5	47.7
Unemployed	1,492	1,095	1,139	1,490	1,301	1,292	1,210	1,207	1,138
Unemployment rate	22.2	16.2	17.8	20.3	18.2	18.5	17.2	17.0	16.2
Men	26.7	18.7	20.9	21.5	18.9	19.8	17.6	17.5	17.8
Women	19.5	13.6	14.5	19.0	17.4	16.9	16.6	16.5	14.5
BLACK									
Civilian noninstitutional population	18,768	19,086	19,196	18,768	18,994	19,026	19,057	19,086	19,196
Civilian labor force	11,397	11,561	11,478	11,544	11,720	11,565	11,623	11,650	11,660
Participation rate	60.7	60.6	59.8	61.5	61.7	60.8	61.0	61.0	60.7
Employed	8,973	9,589	9,513	9,158	9,594	9,449	9,563	9,582	9,707
Employment-population ratio[2]	47.8	50.2	49.6	48.8	50.0	49.7	50.2	50.2	50.6
Unemployed	2,424	1,973	1,965	2,386	2,216	2,116	2,060	2,068	1,953
Unemployment rate	21.3	17.1	17.1	20.7	18.9	18.3	17.7	17.8	16.7
Men, 20 years and over									
Civilian labor force	5,456	5,544	5,569	5,475	5,553	5,581	5,568	5,565	5,621
Participation rate	75.0	76.4	76.1	75.3	76.1	76.2	76.9	76.7	76.8
Employed	4,275	4,706	4,669	4,384	4,613	4,607	4,701	4,722	4,789
Employment-population ratio[2]	58.8	63.2	62.7	60.3	62.4	62.1	63.2	63.4	63.7
Unemployed	1,181	838	900	1,091	940	894	867	843	833
Unemployment rate	21.6	15.1	16.2	19.9	16.9	16.3	15.6	15.1	14.8
Women, 20 years and over									
Civilian labor force	5,488	5,294	5,261	5,269	5,358	5,277	5,270	5,303	5,277
Participation rate	56.8	56.1	55.4	57.0	57.1	56.1	55.9	56.2	55.6
Employed	4,325	4,507	4,499	4,347	4,495	4,438	4,448	4,461	4,522
Employment-population ratio[2]	44.8	47.7	47.4	47.0	47.9	47.2	47.2	47.3	47.7
Unemployed	923	787	761	917	863	839	822	842	755
Unemployment rate	17.6	14.9	14.5	17.4	16.1	15.9	15.6	15.9	14.3
Both sexes, 16 to 19 years									
Civilian labor force	693	723	649	805	809	787	785	782	762
Participation rate	30.8	32.9	29.6	35.7	36.6	35.6	35.6	35.4	34.7
Employed	373	375	345	427	396	404	414	399	397
Employment-population ratio[2]	16.6	17.1	15.7	19.0	17.9	18.3	18.8	18.2	18.1
Unemployed	319	348	304	378	413	383	371	383	365
Unemployment rate	46.1	48.1	46.9	47.0	51.1	48.7	47.3	49.0	47.9
Men	48.0	47.9	46.5	48.0	52.7	45.6	44.9	46.6	47.1
Women	44.0	48.3	47.3	45.7	49.2	52.2	50.0	51.9	48.8
HISPANIC ORIGIN									
Civilian noninstitutional population	9,328	9,735	9,778	9,328	9,700	9,745	9,677	9,735	9,778
Civilian labor force	5,878	6,156	6,195	5,986	6,202	6,165	6,232	6,267	6,336
Participation rate	63.0	63.2	63.4	64.2	63.9	63.3	64.4	64.4	64.8
Employed	4,891	5,466	5,436	5,063	5,392	5,398	5,463	5,540	5,627
Employment-population ratio[2]	52.4	56.1	55.6	54.3	55.6	55.4	56.5	56.9	57.6
Unemployed	987	690	758	923	810	767	769	727	708
Unemployment rate	16.8	11.2	12.2	15.4	13.1	12.4	12.3	11.6	11.2

[1] The population figures are not adjusted for seasonal variation; therefore, identical numbers appear in the unadjusted and seasonally adjusted columns.

[2] Civilian employment as a percent of the civilian noninstitutional population.

NOTE: Detail for the above race and Hispanic-origin groups will not sum to totals because data for the "other races" group are not presented and Hispanics are included in both the white and black population groups.

HOUSEHOLD DATA

Table A-4. Selected employment indicators

Numbers in thousands

Category	Not seasonally adjusted			Seasonally adjusted					
	Jan. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984	Jan. 1983	Sept. 1983	Oct. 1983	Nov. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984
CHARACTERISTIC									
Civilian employed, 16 years and over	97,262	102,883	101,279	99,154	101,876	101,970	102,686	102,941	103,198
Married men, spouse present	36,963	38,393	38,102	37,698	38,232	38,260	38,388	38,494	38,682
Married women, spouse present	24,132	25,433	24,997	24,102	24,921	24,953	25,057	25,140	24,987
Women who maintain families	5,038	5,298	5,293	5,029	5,124	5,172	5,234	5,254	5,293
MAJOR INDUSTRY AND CLASS OF WORKER									
Agriculture:									
Wage and salary workers	1,311	1,249	1,169	1,616	1,572	1,585	1,481	1,512	1,483
Self-employed workers	1,646	1,504	1,671	1,589	1,515	1,527	1,556	1,572	1,613
Unpaid family workers	166	199	167	231	236	227	224	265	233
Nonagricultural industries:									
Wage and salary workers	85,764	91,756	90,816	87,863	90,763	90,617	91,096	91,422	91,641
Government	15,571	15,698	15,675	15,428	15,560	15,578	15,585	15,481	15,535
Private industries	71,193	76,066	74,761	72,437	75,183	75,039	75,509	75,941	76,106
Private households	1,083	1,230	1,099	1,189	1,279	1,278	1,216	1,281	1,197
Other industries	70,110	74,836	73,662	71,257	73,904	73,761	74,293	74,780	74,909
Self-employed workers	7,239	7,681	7,716	7,449	7,656	7,695	7,809	7,736	7,936
Unpaid family workers	343	417	333	376	388	405	474	450	364
PERSONS AT WORK									
Nonagricultural industries	90,719	96,483	94,663	92,726	93,322	93,273	93,836	94,173	94,787
Full-time schedules	71,571	77,312	76,088	71,764	76,666	75,847	75,398	75,802	76,237
Part time for economic reasons	6,533	5,536	5,815	6,678	6,027	5,726	5,888	5,712	5,943
Usually work full time	2,297	1,676	1,906	2,138	1,771	1,617	1,719	1,672	1,771
Usually work part time	4,236	3,860	3,909	4,540	4,256	4,107	4,129	4,040	4,172
Part time for noneconomic reasons	12,615	13,757	12,860	12,284	12,629	12,582	12,588	12,659	12,527

* Excludes persons "with a job but not at work" during the survey period for such reasons as vacation, illness, or industrial dispute.

Table A-8. Range of unemployment measures based on varying definitions of unemployment and the labor force, seasonally adjusted

Percent

Measure	Quarterly averages					Monthly data		
	1982	1983				1983		1984
	IV	I	II	III	IV	Nov.	Dec.	Jan.
U-1 Persons unemployed 15 weeks or longer as a percent of the civilian labor force	4.0	4.2	4.0	3.7	3.1	3.1	3.0	2.9
U-2 Job losers as a percent of the civilian labor force	6.6	6.2	6.0	5.4	4.7	4.7	4.5	4.3
U-3 Unemployed persons 25 years and over as a percent of the civilian labor force	8.3	8.1	7.9	7.3	6.6	6.5	6.4	6.2
U-4 Unemployed full-time jobseekers as a percent of the full-time civilian labor force	10.6	10.3	10.0	9.3	8.3	8.2	8.0	7.8
U-4a Total unemployed as a percent of the labor force, including the resident Armed Forces	10.3	10.2	10.0	9.3	8.4	8.3	8.1	7.9
U-4b Total unemployed as a percent of the civilian labor force	10.6	10.6	10.1	9.4	8.5	8.4	8.2	8.0
U-6 Total full-time jobseekers plus ½ part-time jobseekers plus ½ total on part time for economic reasons as a percent of the civilian labor force less ½ of the part-time labor force	13.7	13.4	13.2	12.2	11.2	11.1	10.8	10.6
U-7 Total full-time jobseekers plus ½ part-time jobseekers plus ½ total on part time for economic reasons plus discouraged workers as a percent of the civilian labor force plus discouraged workers less ½ of the part-time labor force	15.2	14.9	14.6	13.5	12.4	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.

HOUSEHOLD DATA

HOUSEHOLD DATA

Table A-6. Selected unemployment indicators, seasonally adjusted

Category	Number of unemployed persons (in thousands)			Unemployment rates[1]					
	Jan. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984	Jan. 1983	Sept. 1983	Oct. 1983	Nov. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984
CHARACTERISTIC									
Total 16 years and over	11,523	9,195	9,026	10.4	9.2	8.8	8.4	8.2	8.0
Men, 16 years and over	6,683	5,258	5,149	10.7	9.4	9.1	8.6	8.3	8.1
Men, 20 years and over	5,623	4,394	4,300	9.7	8.6	8.2	7.8	7.6	7.3
Women, 16 years and over	4,840	3,937	3,876	10.0	8.8	8.5	8.2	8.1	7.9
Women, 20 years and over	3,979	3,181	3,182	9.8	7.8	7.5	7.2	7.1	7.1
Both sexes, 16 to 19 years	1,921	1,622	1,543	23.1	21.8	21.6	20.2	20.1	19.4
Married men, spouse present	2,920	2,112	2,025	7.2	6.1	5.7	5.5	5.2	5.0
Married women, spouse present	2,058	1,636	1,579	7.8	6.8	6.3	6.0	6.1	6.0
Women who maintain families	767	645	636	13.2	12.0	11.4	11.5	10.9	10.7
Full-time workers	9,811	7,658	7,532	10.3	9.1	8.7	8.2	8.0	7.8
Part-time workers	1,672	1,567	1,466	10.7	10.1	10.0	9.8	9.8	9.2
Labor force time lost[2]	—	—	—	11.7	10.5	10.0	9.7	9.4	9.2
INDUSTRY									
Nonagricultural private wage and salary workers	8,828	6,899	6,568	10.9	9.4	9.0	8.6	8.3	7.9
Mining	189	125	107	17.6	16.9	12.1	12.8	12.4	10.5
Construction	1,057	910	840	20.2	18.1	15.8	15.6	16.3	15.0
Manufacturing	2,861	1,821	1,869	13.1	10.2	9.6	8.9	8.3	8.4
Durable goods	1,893	1,075	1,062	14.7	10.9	10.2	9.0	8.3	8.0
Nondurable goods	968	746	807	10.8	9.3	8.7	8.7	8.2	8.9
Transportation and public utilities	449	376	290	7.8	7.4	7.2	6.7	6.5	5.1
Wholesale and retail trade	2,264	1,880	1,772	10.8	9.5	9.8	9.1	8.8	8.4
Finance and service industries	2,008	1,809	1,691	7.6	7.0	6.9	6.7	6.6	6.3
Government workers	914	815	812	5.6	5.0	5.1	4.9	5.0	5.0
Agricultural wage and salary workers	302	279	265	15.7	16.5	16.2	15.7	15.6	15.5

[1] Unemployed as a percent of the civilian labor force.

[2] Aggregate hours lost by the unemployed and persons on part time for economic reasons as a percent of potentially available labor force hours.

Table A-7. Duration of unemployment

(Numbers in thousands)

Weeks of unemployment	Not seasonally adjusted			Seasonally adjusted					
	Jan. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984	Jan. 1983	Sept. 1983	Oct. 1983	Nov. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984
DURATION									
Less than 5 weeks	6,842	3,159	3,618	3,600	3,740	3,506	3,328	3,382	3,233
5 to 14 weeks	3,498	2,631	2,689	3,331	2,784	2,725	2,616	2,504	2,556
15 weeks and over	4,977	3,202	3,048	4,623	3,889	3,655	3,527	3,369	3,201
15 to 26 weeks	2,244	1,254	1,260	1,954	1,383	1,372	1,337	1,281	1,166
27 weeks and over	2,733	1,948	2,088	2,669	2,506	2,283	2,190	2,085	2,035
Average (mean) duration, in weeks	18.8	19.4	19.8	19.4	20.2	20.1	20.2	19.6	20.5
Median duration, in weeks	10.7	9.1	8.8	11.3	9.4	9.5	9.4	9.0	9.2
PERCENT DISTRIBUTION									
Total unemployed	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Less than 5 weeks	32.3	35.1	37.1	31.2	35.9	35.5	35.1	36.5	36.0
5 to 14 weeks	27.9	29.3	27.6	28.8	26.7	27.6	27.6	27.1	28.4
15 weeks and over	39.8	35.6	35.3	40.0	37.3	37.0	37.2	36.4	35.6
15 to 26 weeks	17.9	13.9	13.9	16.9	13.3	13.9	14.1	13.9	13.0
27 weeks and over	21.8	21.7	21.4	23.1	24.1	23.1	23.1	22.5	22.6

HOUSEHOLD DATA

Table A-8. Reason for unemployment

(Numbers in thousands)

Reason	Not seasonally adjusted			Seasonally adjusted					
	Jan. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984	Jan. 1983	Sept. 1983	Oct. 1983	Nov. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984
NUMBER OF UNEMPLOYED									
Job losers	7,978	5,238	5,636	6,810	5,930	5,601	5,226	5,017	4,825
On layoff	2,987	1,606	1,692	2,151	1,562	1,392	1,321	1,283	1,238
Other job losers	5,031	3,632	3,944	4,659	4,376	4,209	3,905	3,734	3,588
Job leavers	856	766	841	826	858	866	868	855	869
Reentrants	2,633	2,005	2,258	2,557	2,362	2,322	2,250	2,246	2,192
New entrants	1,046	983	1,020	1,199	1,234	1,127	1,154	1,150	1,175
PERCENT DISTRIBUTION									
Total unemployed	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Job losers	63.8	58.2	57.7	59.8	57.1	56.5	55.0	54.1	53.4
On layoff	23.6	15.6	17.3	18.9	15.0	14.0	13.9	13.8	13.7
Other job losers	40.2	42.6	40.4	40.9	42.1	42.4	41.1	40.3	39.9
Job leavers	6.8	8.5	8.6	7.3	8.3	8.7	9.1	9.2	9.0
Reentrants	21.0	22.3	23.1	22.4	22.7	23.4	23.7	24.2	24.4
New entrants	8.4	10.9	10.5	10.5	11.9	11.4	12.1	12.4	13.1
UNEMPLOYED AS A PERCENT OF THE CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE									
Job losers	7.3	4.7	5.1	6.2	5.3	5.0	4.7	4.5	4.3
Job leavers	.8	.7	.8	.7	.8	.8	.8	.8	.7
Reentrants	2.4	1.8	2.0	2.3	2.1	2.1	2.0	2.0	2.0
New entrants	1.0	.9	.9	1.1	1.1	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0

Table A-9. Unemployed persons by sex and age, seasonally adjusted

Sex and age	Number of unemployed persons (in thousands)			Unemployment rates*					
	Jan. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984	Jan. 1983	Sept. 1983	Oct. 1983	Nov. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984
Total, 16 years and over	11,523	9,195	9,026	10.4	9.2	8.8	8.4	8.2	8.0
16 to 24 years	4,493	3,564	3,537	18.4	16.5	16.3	15.4	14.9	14.8
16 to 19 years	1,921	1,622	1,543	23.1	21.8	21.6	20.2	20.1	19.4
16 to 17 years	783	700	649	24.5	20.0	24.0	21.9	22.9	21.9
18 to 19 years	1,125	947	878	22.0	20.5	20.3	19.3	18.8	17.6
20 to 24 years	2,572	1,942	1,994	16.0	13.0	13.6	13.0	12.2	12.5
25 years and over	7,013	5,699	5,476	6.1	7.2	6.3	6.5	6.4	6.2
25 to 54 years	6,212	4,938	4,789	6.7	7.7	7.2	6.9	6.8	6.5
55 years and over	818	742	700	5.4	5.2	5.0	4.9	4.9	4.7
Men, 16 years and over	6,683	5,258	5,149	10.7	9.6	9.1	8.6	8.3	8.1
16 to 24 years	2,567	1,998	1,971	19.8	17.6	17.3	15.9	15.6	15.6
16 to 19 years	1,060	866	849	24.3	22.8	22.5	20.2	20.4	20.8
16 to 17 years	422	372	336	24.8	23.9	24.3	22.0	23.3	21.6
18 to 19 years	629	501	501	23.7	22.2	21.6	19.6	18.9	19.6
20 to 24 years	1,507	1,132	1,122	17.6	15.0	14.7	13.8	13.3	13.1
25 years and over	4,088	3,283	3,154	8.3	7.5	7.0	6.8	6.5	6.2
25 to 54 years	3,588	2,799	2,703	8.8	8.0	7.4	7.1	6.7	6.6
55 years and over	522	481	431	5.8	5.6	5.4	5.4	5.4	4.8
Women, 16 years and over	4,840	3,937	3,876	10.0	8.8	8.5	8.2	8.1	7.9
16 to 24 years	1,926	1,566	1,566	16.8	15.2	15.1	14.7	14.0	13.9
16 to 19 years	861	756	694	21.8	20.6	20.5	20.1	19.8	18.0
16 to 17 years	361	328	313	24.1	24.0	23.6	21.8	22.5	22.2
18 to 19 years	496	446	377	20.1	18.5	18.8	19.0	18.7	15.4
20 to 24 years	1,065	810	872	14.2	12.5	12.3	12.0	11.0	11.7
25 years and over	2,925	2,376	2,320	6.0	6.9	6.5	6.2	6.3	6.2
25 to 54 years	2,624	2,139	2,046	6.6	7.3	7.0	6.6	6.8	6.5
55 years and over	296	261	269	4.9	4.5	4.4	4.1	4.3	4.5

* Unemployment as a percent of the civilian labor force.

HOUSEHOLD DATA

Table A-10. Employment status of black and other workers

(Numbers in thousands)

Employment status	Not seasonally adjusted			Seasonally adjusted[1]					
	Jan. 1982	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984	Jan. 1983	Sept. 1983	Oct. 1983	Nov. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984
Civilian noninstitutional population	23,225	23,637	23,594	23,225	23,581	23,604	23,627	23,637	23,594
Civilian labor force	14,287	14,492	14,258	14,385	14,692	14,528	14,509	14,539	14,425
Participation rate	61.3	61.1	60.4	61.9	62.3	61.5	61.4	61.5	61.1
Employed	11,502	12,178	12,002	11,672	12,156	12,094	12,171	12,171	12,179
Employment-population ratio[2]	49.5	51.5	50.9	50.3	51.5	51.2	51.5	51.5	51.6
Unemployed	2,785	2,268	2,256	2,713	2,536	2,432	2,338	2,368	2,286
Unemployment rate	19.3	15.7	15.8	18.9	17.3	16.7	16.1	16.3	15.8
Not in labor force	8,978	9,195	9,336	8,840	8,889	9,076	9,118	9,098	9,169

[1] The population figures are not adjusted for seasonal variation; therefore, identical numbers appear in the unadjusted and seasonally adjusted columns.

[2] Civilian employment as a percent of the civilian noninstitutional population.

Table A-11. Occupational status of the employed and unemployed, not seasonally adjusted

(Numbers in thousands)

Occupation	Civilian employed		Unemployed		Unemployment rate	
	Jan. 1983	Jan. 1984	Jan. 1983	Jan. 1984	Jan. 1983	Jan. 1984
Total, 16 years and over[1]	97,262	101,270	12,517	9,755	11.4	8.8
Managerial and professional specialty	23,363	24,384	941	757	3.9	3.0
Executive, administrative, and managerial	10,697	11,169	498	399	4.4	3.4
Professional specialty	12,665	13,214	443	359	3.4	2.6
Technical, sales, and administrative support	30,696	31,466	2,435	1,916	7.3	5.7
Technicians and related support	3,080	3,129	167	122	5.3	3.7
Sales occupations	11,339	12,108	978	798	7.9	6.2
Administrative support, including clerical	16,357	16,230	1,290	996	7.3	5.8
Service occupations	13,302	13,729	1,778	1,505	11.8	9.9
Private household	915	913	81	80	8.1	8.0
Protective service	1,617	1,669	119	96	6.9	5.4
Service, except private household and protective	10,770	11,162	1,574	1,329	12.8	10.7
Precision production, craft, and repair	11,623	12,578	1,833	1,390	13.6	10.0
Mechanics and repairers	4,113	4,283	418	290	9.2	6.3
Construction trades	3,853	4,208	952	740	19.8	15.0
Other precision production, craft, and repair	3,658	4,079	464	359	11.2	8.1
Operators, fabricators, and laborers	15,186	16,254	3,934	2,627	20.6	13.9
Machine operators, assemblers, and inspectors	7,393	7,941	1,783	1,136	19.4	12.7
Transportation and material moving occupations	3,993	4,190	903	527	18.4	11.2
Handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers, and laborers	3,801	4,223	1,247	964	24.7	18.6
Construction laborers	537	539	275	137	39.6	20.5
Other handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers, and laborers	3,364	3,683	972	727	22.4	16.5
Farming, forestry, and fishing	3,094	2,872	477	451	13.4	13.6

[1] Persons with no previous work experience and those whose last job was in the Armed Forces are included in the unemployed total.

HOUSEHOLD DATA

Table A-12. Employment status of male Vietnam-era veterans and nonveterans by age, not seasonally adjusted

(Numbers in thousands)

Veteran status and age	Civilian noninstitutional population		Civilian labor force							
			Total		Employed		Unemployed			
							Number		Percent of labor force	
	Jan. 1983	Jan. 1984	Jan. 1983	Jan. 1984	Jan. 1983	Jan. 1984	Jan. 1983	Jan. 1984	Jan. 1983	Jan. 1984
VETERANS										
Total, 25 years and over	8,268	7,909	7,776	7,383	6,893	6,812	883	571	11.4	7.7
25 to 39 years	4,577	5,684	6,284	5,845	5,517	4,983	767	862	12.2	8.5
25 to 29 years	966	579	916	545	716	459	200	86	21.8	15.8
30 to 34 years	2,545	1,927	2,393	1,820	2,094	1,635	299	185	12.5	10.2
35 to 39 years	3,066	3,178	2,975	3,080	2,707	2,889	268	191	9.0	6.2
40 years and over	1,691	2,225	1,492	1,938	1,376	1,829	116	109	7.8	5.6
NONVETERANS										
Total, 25 to 39 years	19,234	20,613	18,094	19,381	16,065	17,718	2,029	1,650	11.2	8.5
25 to 29 years	8,471	8,845	7,882	8,251	6,881	7,430	1,001	821	13.7	10.0
30 to 34 years	6,409	7,123	6,096	6,731	5,527	6,199	569	532	9.3	7.9
35 to 39 years	4,334	4,645	4,116	4,412	3,737	4,115	379	297	9.2	6.7

NOTE: Male Vietnam-era veterans are men who served in the Armed Forces between August 5, 1964 and May 7, 1975. Nonveterans are men who have never served in the Armed Forces; published data are limited to those 25 to 39 years of age, the group that most closely corresponds to the bulk of the Vietnam-era veteran population.

HOUSEHOLD DATA

HOUSEHOLD DATA

Table A-13. Employment status of the civilian population for ten large States

(Numbers in thousands)

State and employment status	Not seasonally adjusted[1]			Seasonally adjusted[2]					
	Jan. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984	Jan. 1983	Sept. 1983	Oct. 1983	Nov. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984
California									
Civilian noninstitutional population	18,637	18,954	18,983	18,637	18,878	18,905	18,930	18,954	18,983
Civilian labor force	12,237	12,480	12,357	12,272	12,404	12,333	12,408	12,389	12,391
Employed	10,803	11,488	11,226	10,922	11,288	11,279	11,367	11,388	11,350
Unemployed	1,434	993	1,132	1,350	1,116	1,054	1,041	1,001	1,045
Unemployment rate	11.7	8.0	9.2	11.0	9.0	8.5	8.4	8.1	8.4
Florida									
Civilian noninstitutional population	8,255	8,435	8,453	8,255	8,382	8,400	8,418	8,433	8,453
Civilian labor force	4,789	5,101	4,984	4,873	5,041	4,938	5,009	5,097	5,067
Employed	4,290	4,719	4,617	4,346	4,637	4,537	4,619	4,717	4,713
Unemployed	499	382	367	487	404	401	390	380	354
Unemployment rate	10.4	7.5	7.4	10.0	8.0	8.1	7.8	7.5	7.0
Illinois									
Civilian noninstitutional population	8,563	8,586	8,588	8,563	8,583	8,585	8,586	8,586	8,588
Civilian labor force	5,593	5,514	5,304	5,645	5,558	5,527	5,544	5,540	5,353
Employed	4,840	4,994	4,915	4,930	4,990	4,976	5,011	5,008	5,005
Unemployed	758	520	389	715	568	548	533	532	348
Unemployment rate	13.5	9.4	10.7	12.7	10.2	9.9	9.6	9.6	9.9
Massachusetts									
Civilian noninstitutional population	4,470	4,497	4,499	4,470	4,492	4,494	4,496	4,497	4,499
Civilian labor force	2,959	3,031	3,011	2,977	3,013	2,991	3,014	3,017	3,028
Employed	2,702	2,855	2,790	2,744	2,800	2,787	2,814	2,823	2,831
Unemployed	257	176	221	233	213	204	200	194	197
Unemployment rate	8.7	5.8	7.3	7.8	7.1	6.8	6.6	6.4	6.5
Michigan									
Civilian noninstitutional population	6,750	6,737	6,736	6,750	6,744	6,742	6,740	6,737	6,736
Civilian labor force	4,269	4,216	4,146	4,331	4,303	4,252	4,216	4,241	4,207
Employed	3,543	3,714	3,616	3,649	3,719	3,687	3,696	3,748	3,722
Unemployed	726	501	530	682	584	565	520	493	485
Unemployment rate	17.0	11.9	12.8	15.7	13.6	13.3	12.3	11.6	11.5
New Jersey									
Civilian noninstitutional population	5,724	5,772	5,776	5,724	5,762	5,766	5,769	5,772	5,776
Civilian labor force	3,582	3,758	3,730	3,603	3,695	3,681	3,685	3,762	3,774
Employed	3,261	3,512	3,464	3,298	3,398	3,405	3,428	3,503	3,503
Unemployed	321	246	267	305	297	256	257	259	271
Unemployment rate	9.0	6.5	7.4	8.5	8.0	7.0	7.0	6.9	7.2
New York									
Civilian noninstitutional population	13,513	13,599	13,605	13,513	13,588	13,592	13,596	13,599	13,605
Civilian labor force	7,878	7,951	7,888	7,922	8,191	8,098	8,098	8,056	7,939
Employed	7,125	7,397	7,351	7,220	7,487	7,448	7,476	7,435	7,353
Unemployed	753	554	537	702	704	650	622	601	586
Unemployment rate	9.6	7.0	6.1	8.9	8.6	8.0	7.7	7.5	7.4
Ohio									
Civilian noninstitutional population	8,048	8,050	8,050	8,048	8,051	8,051	8,051	8,050	8,050
Civilian labor force	4,931	5,040	4,964	5,057	5,087	5,110	5,113	5,097	5,095
Employed	4,194	4,513	4,432	4,357	4,501	4,543	4,557	4,561	4,619
Unemployed	737	528	513	700	586	567	556	536	476
Unemployment rate	14.9	10.5	10.3	13.8	11.5	11.1	10.9	10.5	9.3
Pennsylvania									
Civilian noninstitutional population	9,166	9,196	9,198	9,166	9,192	9,194	9,195	9,196	9,198
Civilian labor force	5,418	5,508	5,383	5,481	5,538	5,532	5,534	5,519	5,451
Employed	4,612	4,947	4,841	4,758	4,941	4,960	4,969	4,963	4,997
Unemployed	806	562	542	723	597	572	565	576	454
Unemployment rate	14.9	10.2	10.1	13.2	10.8	10.3	10.3	10.4	8.3
Texas									
Civilian noninstitutional population	11,133	11,402	11,429	11,133	11,327	11,353	11,378	11,402	11,429
Civilian labor force	7,600	7,731	7,635	7,612	7,715	7,666	7,637	7,743	7,648
Employed	6,953	7,182	7,079	6,991	7,067	7,092	7,124	7,146	7,118
Unemployed	647	548	556	621	648	574	533	597	530
Unemployment rate	8.5	7.1	7.3	8.2	8.4	7.5	7.0	7.7	6.9

[1] These are the official Bureau of Labor Statistics' estimates used in the administration of Federal fund allocation programs.

[2] The population figures are not adjusted for seasonal variation; therefore, identical numbers appear in the unadjusted and the seasonally adjusted columns.

NOTE: The not seasonally labor force estimates for 1983 have been revised to reflect the latest 1985 population estimates for the States. These revised estimates were used to develop seasonally adjusted data for 1983 and seasonal factors to be used in 1984.

ESTABLISHMENT DATA

Table B-1. Employees on nonagricultural payrolls by industry

(In thousands)

Industry	Not seasonally adjusted				Seasonally adjusted					
	Jan. 1983	Nov. 1983	Dec. 1983 p	Jan. 1984 p	Jan. 1983	Sept. 1983	Oct. 1983	Nov. 1983	Dec. 1983 p	Jan. 1984 p
Total	87,660	92,961	92,232	90,576	88,885	90,831	91,084	91,333	91,583	91,878
Total private	71,905	76,057	76,257	74,865	73,132	74,990	75,312	75,579	75,815	76,163
Goods-producing	22,601	24,544	24,333	23,980	23,186	23,935	24,168	24,311	24,412	24,612
Mining	1,028	1,043	1,044	1,035	1,037	1,026	1,044	1,045	1,046	1,043
Oil and gas extraction	659	652	650	657	660	639	648	655	662	658
Construction	3,528	4,245	4,058	3,787	3,903	4,038	4,060	4,094	4,081	4,194
General building contractors	901	1,101	1,073	1,009	985	1,045	1,052	1,062	1,073	1,103
Manufacturing	18,045	19,256	19,231	19,158	18,246	18,871	19,064	19,172	19,275	19,375
Production workers	12,115	13,218	13,181	13,131	12,291	12,859	13,043	13,147	13,237	13,328
Durable goods	10,496	11,394	11,379	11,332	10,594	11,081	11,235	11,320	11,405	11,463
Production workers	6,847	7,630	7,641	7,626	6,931	7,378	7,522	7,601	7,667	7,726
Lumber and wood products	681.0	711.6	700.3	690.4	625	703	712	714	716	718
Furniture and fixtures	429.9	475.1	477.1	476.3	430	459	465	470	473	476
Stone, clay, and glass products	535.5	597.3	583.2	569.4	557	585	590	590	589	593
Primary metal industries	813.3	862.5	867.2	869.1	817	849	867	871	880	872
Blast furnaces and basic steel products	334.4	337.8	338.6	339.2	334	340	344	342	342	339
Fabricated metal products	1,353.8	1,446.9	1,448.8	1,445.5	1,384	1,431	1,430	1,438	1,449	1,457
Machinery, except electrical	2,046.5	2,154.1	2,180.7	2,192.6	2,048	2,115	2,131	2,158	2,176	2,195
Electrical and electronic equipment	1,969.6	2,131.8	2,150.7	2,158.8	1,974	2,082	2,107	2,128	2,146	2,165
Transportation equipment	1,689.3	1,876.6	1,880.6	1,872.2	1,710	1,801	1,848	1,862	1,892	1,895
Motor vehicles and equipment	682.9	845.7	848.1	832.2	702	796	817	821	843	856
Instruments and related products	693.0	701.0	701.9	702.5	695	696	699	701	702	705
Miscellaneous manufacturing	362.2	397.0	387.7	373.1	374	380	386	388	392	387
Nondurable goods	7,549	7,900	7,852	7,806	7,650	7,790	7,829	7,852	7,870	7,912
Production workers	5,268	5,588	5,540	5,505	5,360	5,481	5,521	5,546	5,568	5,602
Food and kindred products	1,574.9	1,654.7	1,616.6	1,587.7	1,626	1,630	1,628	1,633	1,628	1,640
Tobacco manufactures	71.0	66.2	64.6	63.3	69	63	64	61	62	61
Textile mill products	721.1	762.7	765.4	758.8	726	753	759	758	760	765
Apparel and other textile products	1,129.7	1,208.5	1,194.1	1,190.1	1,130	1,177	1,191	1,199	1,206	1,212
Paper and allied products	648.7	667.3	669.5	667.1	653	662	665	668	670	671
Printing and publishing	1,265.2	1,304.8	1,312.1	1,309.5	1,266	1,290	1,297	1,301	1,303	1,310
Chemicals and allied products	1,049.9	1,059.0	1,059.6	1,059.4	1,057	1,060	1,061	1,061	1,063	1,067
Petroleum and coal products	193.5	194.2	190.2	187.3	200	195	193	193	193	192
Rubber and miscellaneous plastics products	682.3	763.3	765.8	770.0	688	742	753	762	769	777
Leather and leather products	211.0	221.3	216.1	212.8	213	218	218	218	217	217
Service-producing	65,059	67,517	67,899	66,596	65,699	66,916	66,916	67,044	67,171	67,236
Transportation and public utilities	4,914	5,049	5,035	4,966	4,979	5,031	5,019	5,010	5,003	5,031
Transportation	2,656	2,781	2,770	2,709	2,706	2,766	2,754	2,749	2,736	2,760
Communication and public utilities	2,258	2,268	2,265	2,257	2,273	2,265	2,265	2,270	2,269	2,271
Wholesale trade	5,145	5,312	5,323	5,297	5,185	5,274	5,287	5,291	5,312	5,340
Durable goods	3,007	3,118	3,132	3,130	3,023	3,097	3,108	3,114	3,131	3,148
Nondurable goods	2,138	2,194	2,191	2,167	2,162	2,177	2,179	2,178	2,180	2,192
Retail trade	14,963	15,643	16,016	15,280	15,170	15,338	15,379	15,427	15,461	15,497
General merchandise stores	2,237	2,370	2,553	2,289	2,178	2,222	2,231	2,246	2,227	2,228
Food stores	2,480	2,537	2,563	2,506	2,474	2,491	2,509	2,510	2,510	2,521
Automotive dealers and service stations	1,595	1,638	1,638	1,640	1,601	1,632	1,635	1,636	1,638	1,647
Eating and drinking places	4,634	4,874	4,866	4,684	4,896	4,903	4,899	4,899	4,905	4,925
Finance, insurance, and real estate	5,335	5,493	5,507	5,501	5,374	5,499	5,503	5,515	5,524	5,540
Finance	2,668	2,757	2,771	2,773	2,671	2,750	2,758	2,765	2,770	2,775
Insurance	1,705	1,713	1,718	1,716	1,710	1,713	1,715	1,717	1,716	1,721
Real estate	962	1,022	1,019	1,012	993	1,036	1,030	1,035	1,038	1,044
Services	18,947	20,016	20,041	19,841	19,238	19,913	19,936	20,016	20,101	20,143
Business services	3,356	3,793	3,846	3,813	3,377	3,693	3,729	3,748	3,808	3,835
Health services	5,875	5,989	5,987	6,002	5,884	5,985	5,983	5,983	5,993	6,014
Government	15,755	16,904	15,975	15,711	15,753	15,841	15,772	15,776	15,768	15,707
Federal	2,724	2,744	2,757	2,738	2,748	2,778	2,761	2,763	2,771	2,760
State	3,606	3,746	3,722	3,605	3,631	3,648	3,646	3,646	3,646	3,629
Local	9,425	9,513	9,496	9,369	9,374	9,435	9,365	9,367	9,349	9,319

p = preliminary.

ESTABLISHMENT DATA

Table B-2. Average weekly hours of production or nonsupervisory workers[1] on private nonagricultural payrolls by industry

Industry	Not seasonally adjusted				Seasonally adjusted					
	Jan. 1983	Nov. 1983	Dec. 1983 p	Jan. 1984 p	Jan. 1983	Sept. 1983	Oct. 1983	Nov. 1983	Dec. 1983 p	Jan. 1984 p
Total private	34.6	35.1	35.5	35.1	35.1	35.2	35.3	35.2	35.3	35.6
Mining	42.5	42.9	43.6	43.3	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Construction	36.3	36.3	36.8	36.3	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Manufacturing	39.2	40.8	41.2	40.8	39.7	40.8	40.6	40.6	40.5	40.9
Overtime hours	2.3	3.4	3.6	3.2	2.4	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.4	3.4
Durable goods	39.7	41.5	42.0	41.2	40.1	41.5	41.2	41.2	41.2	41.6
Overtime hours	2.1	3.6	3.8	3.4	2.2	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.5	3.6
Lumber and wood products	39.1	39.4	40.0	39.5	40.5	40.5	40.3	39.7	39.9	40.9
Furniture and fixtures	37.5	40.1	41.1	39.3	38.6	40.0	39.8	39.7	40.2	40.5
Stone, clay, and glass products	40.1	42.0	41.9	40.9	41.6	42.1	41.7	41.7	41.6	42.1
Primary metal industries	39.3	41.6	42.4	41.7	38.9	41.2	41.7	41.6	42.0	41.7
Blast furnaces and basic steel products	37.6	40.3	41.7	40.5	37.5	40.8	40.8	40.4	41.7	40.4
Fabricated metal products	39.5	41.6	42.3	41.2	39.9	41.6	41.2	41.4	41.4	41.6
Machinery, except electrical	39.6	41.6	42.4	41.9	39.6	41.2	41.3	41.3	41.4	41.9
Electrical and electronic equipment	39.7	41.8	41.8	41.2	39.9	41.1	41.1	41.1	40.9	41.4
Transportation equipment	41.1	42.9	43.3	42.3	41.6	43.5	42.5	43.5	41.9	42.8
Motor vehicles and equipment	41.4	44.1	44.6	43.2	42.4	45.3	43.7	43.8	42.5	44.3
Instruments and related products	40.1	41.0	41.4	40.9	40.4	41.0	40.7	40.6	40.7	41.2
Miscellaneous manufacturing	38.7	39.9	40.0	38.9	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Nondurable goods	38.6	40.0	40.1	39.3	39.1	39.9	39.7	39.7	39.7	39.8
Overtime hours	2.5	3.2	3.1	3.0	2.6	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.2	3.1
Food and kindred products	39.3	39.8	40.1	39.3	39.3	39.9	39.7	39.5	39.6	39.5
Tobacco manufactures	36.5	40.2	37.7	36.5	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Textile mill products	39.0	41.0	41.0	39.9	39.7	41.3	40.7	40.7	40.7	40.7
Apparel and other textile products	35.4	36.7	36.6	35.9	36.6	36.8	36.5	36.4	36.4	37.1
Paper and allied products	41.7	43.2	43.7	43.0	41.8	43.3	43.2	43.3	42.9	43.1
Printing and publishing	37.1	38.1	38.4	37.4	37.5	37.8	38.0	37.9	37.6	37.8
Chemicals and allied products	40.3	42.1	42.4	41.6	41.0	41.7	41.7	41.8	41.9	41.8
Petroleum and coal products	43.5	43.9	44.4	43.7	44.5	43.2	43.5	43.6	44.5	44.7
Rubber and miscellaneous plastics products	40.1	42.0	42.4	42.0	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Leather and leather products	35.3	37.3	37.2	35.6	36.3	37.7	37.5	37.2	36.9	36.2
Transportation and public utilities	38.3	39.3	39.6	39.2	38.6	39.4	39.4	39.2	39.3	39.6
Wholesale trade	38.3	38.8	39.0	38.6	38.5	38.7	38.7	38.7	38.7	38.8
Retail trade	29.2	29.8	30.7	29.7	29.9	29.7	30.0	30.0	30.3	30.4
Finance, insurance, and real estate	36.5	36.1	36.2	36.6	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Services	32.7	32.6	32.6	32.6	32.9	32.8	32.9	32.7	32.6	32.8

[1] Data relate to production workers in mining and manufacturing; to construction workers in construction; and to nonsupervisory workers in transportation and public utilities, wholesale and retail trade; finance, insurance, and real estate; and services. These groups account for approximately four-fifths of the total employees on private nonagricultural payrolls.

[2] This series is not published seasonally adjusted since the seasonal component is small relative to the trend-cycle and/or irregular components and consequently cannot be separated with sufficient precision.

p = preliminary.

Table B-3. Average hourly and weekly earnings of production or nonsupervisory workers[1] on private nonagricultural payrolls by industry

Industry	Average hourly earnings				Average weekly earnings			
	Jan. 1983	Nov. 1983	Dec. 1983 p	Jan. 1984 p	Jan. 1983	Nov. 1983	Dec. 1983 p	Jan. 1984 p
Total private	87.90	88.16	88.15	88.24	$273.34	$286.42	$289.33	$289.22
Seasonally adjusted	7.88	8.13	8.16	8.21	276.59	286.18	288.05	292.28
Mining	11.21	11.43	11.45	11.56	476.43	490.35	499.22	500.55
Construction	11.95	11.89	12.01	12.04	440.96	431.61	441.97	437.05
Manufacturing	8.71	8.99	9.06	9.07	341.43	366.79	373.27	366.43
Durable goods	9.26	9.56	9.62	9.62	367.62	396.74	404.04	396.34
Lumber and wood products	7.68	7.88	7.88	7.85	300.29	308.88	312.00	311.66
Furniture and fixtures	6.89	6.72	6.77	6.77	263.38	269.47	278.25	266.06
Stone, clay, and glass products	9.10	9.41	9.41	9.44	364.91	395.22	394.28	385.15
Primary metal industries	11.56	11.31	11.32	11.36	450.84	470.50	479.97	473.71
Blast furnaces and basic steel products	13.73	12.75	12.72	12.73	516.25	513.83	530.42	515.57
Fabricated metal products	8.98	9.27	9.38	9.34	354.71	385.63	396.77	384.81
Machinery, except electrical	9.80	9.91	9.91	9.90	372.24	408.10	422.17	414.01
Electrical and electronic equipment	8.53	8.78	8.85	8.88	338.64	363.49	369.93	365.86
Transportation equipment	11.40	12.02	12.06	11.96	468.54	515.66	522.20	505.91
Motor vehicles and equipment	11.75	12.51	12.51	12.40	486.45	531.69	537.95	535.68
Instruments and related products	8.62	8.62	8.70	8.67	337.64	353.42	360.18	354.60
Miscellaneous manufacturing	6.72	6.96	6.99	7.05	260.06	273.71	279.60	274.25
Nondurable goods	7.97	8.18	8.24	8.28	307.68	327.20	330.42	325.40
Food and kindred products	8.09	8.23	8.31	8.36	315.51	327.55	333.23	329.55
Tobacco manufactures	9.87	10.74	10.28	10.67	360.26	431.75	387.56	389.46
Textile mill products	6.08	6.26	6.31	6.40	237.12	256.66	258.71	255.36
Apparel and other textile products	5.33	5.45	5.47	5.51	188.68	200.02	200.20	197.81
Paper and allied products	9.65	10.19	10.24	10.23	402.61	440.21	447.49	439.89
Printing and publishing	8.97	9.27	9.32	9.29	332.79	353.19	357.89	347.45
Chemicals and allied products	10.38	10.86	10.89	10.90	421.87	457.21	461.74	453.44
Petroleum and coal products	13.16	13.68	13.60	13.63	572.86	590.02	603.84	595.63
Rubber and miscellaneous plastics products	7.91	8.10	8.20	8.23	317.19	340.20	347.68	345.66
Leather and leather products	5.50	5.54	5.57	5.65	196.90	207.39	207.20	201.14
Transportation and public utilities	10.68	11.01	11.00	11.05	409.09	432.89	435.60	433.16
Wholesale trade	8.31	8.54	8.60	8.67	318.27	331.35	335.40	336.66
Retail trade	5.65	5.81	5.77	5.86	184.98	173.14	177.14	174.94
Finance, insurance, and real estate	7.19	7.39	7.42	7.56	262.44	266.78	268.50	276.70
Services	7.18	7.41	7.43	7.54	234.79	241.57	242.22	245.80

[1] See footnote 1, table B-2.

p = preliminary.

Table B-4. Hourly Earnings Index for production or nonsupervisory workers[1] on private nonagricultural payrolls by industry

(1977 = 100)

Industry	Not seasonally adjusted					Seasonally adjusted						
	Jan. 1983	Nov. 1983	Dec. 1983 p	Jan. 1984 p	Percent change from: Jan. 1983–Jan. 1984	Jan. 1983	Sept. 1983	Oct. 1983	Nov. 1983	Dec. 1983 p	Jan. 1984 p	Percent change from: Dec. 1984–Jan. 1984
Total private nonfarm:												
Current dollars	153.4	157.1	157.6	158.8	3.6	152.7	155.9	156.8	156.9	157.5	158.2	0.5
Constant (1977) dollars	95.3	94.6	94.9	N.A.	(2)	94.7	94.2	94.6	94.5	94.5	N.A.	(3)
Mining	164.7	169.8	170.1	171.6	4.2	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)
Construction	144.2	145.0	145.8	146.0	1.3	144.0	145.5	145.1	144.6	145.2	145.8	.4
Manufacturing	157.0	159.7	160.4	161.1	3.6	156.5	158.3	158.9	159.7	160.1	160.6	.4
Transportation and public utilities	153.0	159.8	159.9	160.9	3.8	154.4	157.2	158.4	158.7	159.2	160.2	.6
Wholesale and retail trade	149.4	153.8	153.9	155.2	3.8	148.9	153.1	154.1	154.1	154.6	154.7	(5)
Finance, insurance, and real estate	136.7	141.0	141.7	144.8	5.2	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)
Services	153.5	158.5	159.0	161.2	5.0	152.2	157.1	158.4	158.1	159.0	159.9	.6

1 See footnote 1, table B-2.
2 Percent change was .4 percent from December 1982 to December 1983, the latest month available.
3 Percent change was .2 percent from November 1983 to December 1983, the latest month available.
4 These series are not seasonally adjusted since the seasonal component is small relative to the trend-cycle and/or irregular components and consequently cannot be separated with sufficient precision.
5 Percent change is less than .05 percent.
N.A. = not available.
p = preliminary.

ESTABLISHMENT DATA

Table B-5. Indexes of aggregate weekly hours of production or nonsupervisory workers[1] on private nonagricultural payrolls by industry

(1977 = 100)

Industry	Not seasonally adjusted				Seasonally adjusted					
	Jan. 1983	Nov. 1983	Dec. 1983 p	Jan. 1984 p	Jan. 1983	Sept. 1983	Oct. 1983	Nov. 1983	Dec. 1983 p	Jan. 1984 p
Total	100.7	109.0	110.8	106.6	104.1	107.5	108.1	108.3	108.8	110.2
Goods-producing	85.3	97.8	97.7	94.2	89.8	95.1	95.6	96.3	96.8	99.2
Mining	115.5	119.0	120.6	119.3	118.6	117.0	118.5	118.1	118.9	121.1
Construction	88.1	109.1	104.6	94.4	106.2	106.0	103.9	105.2	105.6	112.9
Manufacturing	83.3	94.7	95.3	93.0	85.5	92.0	92.9	93.5	94.0	95.4
Durable goods	79.8	92.9	94.3	92.2	81.4	89.8	91.1	91.9	92.7	94.4
Lumber and wood products	78.6	96.3	95.7	92.9	84.9	97.0	98.0	97.0	97.8	100.5
Furniture and fixtures	85.3	102.2	105.3	100.5	88.0	98.0	99.1	100.1	102.0	103.8
Stone, clay, and glass products	73.3	88.0	85.2	80.3	78.9	85.7	85.9	86.1	85.5	87.1
Primary metal industries	61.3	71.2	73.0	72.1	61.2	68.9	71.6	72.1	73.6	72.2
Blast furnaces and basic steel products	53.1	59.5	61.6	60.0	53.0	59.8	60.7	60.7	62.3	59.6
Fabricated metal products	78.1	89.7	91.2	88.9	79.2	86.9	87.8	88.5	89.3	90.8
Machinery, except electrical	79.6	90.5	94.1	93.4	79.4	87.0	88.2	90.0	91.3	93.5
Electrical and electronic equipment	93.9	108.8	110.9	110.4	94.3	104.7	106.5	108.0	108.4	111.3
Transportation equipment	77.7	94.2	95.8	92.1	79.4	89.9	91.1	92.0	92.3	95.0
Motor vehicles and equipment	64.2	89.5	91.0	85.7	65.7	85.0	86.7	85.4	86.0	90.8
Instruments and related products	101.5	105.9	106.8	106.4	102.7	105.0	105.1	105.1	106.8	107.4
Miscellaneous manufacturing	76.4	89.3	86.6	81.1	81.0	82.9	85.0	85.0	86.7	85.8
Nondurable goods	88.6	97.3	96.9	94.3	91.7	95.3	95.6	95.8	96.0	97.1
Food and kindred products	96.1	98.4	96.1	92.0	95.1	96.3	95.8	95.9	95.8	96.6
Tobacco manufactures	94.3	91.6	87.0	82.1	94.6	83.6	84.7	83.4	80.8	81.5
Textile mill products	75.1	84.8	84.7	81.9	78.2	83.9	83.4	83.5	83.9	84.4
Apparel and other textile products	84.0	93.7	91.9	90.1	90.0	91.2	91.7	92.1	92.5	95.1
Paper and allied products	96.5	97.3	98.8	96.9	91.2	96.5	96.8	96.6	97.1	97.8
Printing and publishing	105.6	112.7	114.5	111.0	107.0	109.8	111.3	111.8	110.9	112.1
Chemicals and allied products	92.6	96.6	97.6	95.8	93.8	95.5	95.9	96.2	96.8	97.1
Petroleum and coal products	90.5	90.7	88.7	85.9	95.4	90.1	89.9	89.8	89.6	90.8
Rubber and miscellaneous plastics products	91.1	109.0	110.5	110.2	91.1	105.7	106.7	108.0	109.3	111.3
Leather and leather products	77.6	86.2	83.2	78.4	81.0	85.6	85.1	84.4	83.3	81.7
Service-producing	109.2	115.1	117.8	113.5	112.0	116.8	115.7	116.9	115.6	116.2
Transportation and public utilities	96.8	102.1	102.4	99.5	99.0	102.0	101.8	101.1	101.1	102.2
Wholesale trade	105.2	110.2	111.0	109.5	106.8	109.3	109.5	109.6	109.9	111.0
Retail trade	99.9	106.4	112.8	103.3	103.4	104.1	105.4	105.7	106.9	107.1
Finance, insurance, and real estate	116.6	119.3	120.1	120.8	117.8	119.5	120.2	119.8	120.5	121.8
Services	121.0	127.7	128.2	126.5	126.1	128.0	128.4	128.2	128.4	129.3

[1] See footnote 1, table B-2.

p = preliminary.

Table B-6. Indexes of diffusion: Percent of industries in which employment[1] increased

Time span	Year	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.
Over 1-month span	1982	28.5	43.4	36.0	39.0	47.6	32.8	38.4	37.1	34.1	29.3	32.0	42.2
	1983	36.5	45.7	62.4	69.1	71.0	64.5	68.5	68.0	60.8	70.7	64.5	64.2p
	1984	66.7p											
Over 3-month span	1982	25.3	28.8	32.0	34.1	32.5	33.6	37.2	37.2	38.1	33.5	24.7	40.6
	1983	45.4	55.1	65.6	75.8	76.1	77.2	73.9	79.6	79.6	74.2	71.2p	73.1p
	1984												
Over 6-month span	1982	20.2	23.7	25.3	29.8	26.1	26.1	23.4	19.1	21.2	26.1	26.6	35.8
	1983	30.5	63.2	73.4	76.3	79.3	83.6	81.5	80.4	82.5p	82.3p		
	1984												
Over 12-month span	1982	22.0	20.7	18.0	19.4	18.3	20.7	20.7	22.8	24.2	31.3	37.6	44.1
	1983	48.9	58.3	62.6	73.4	76.1	80.6p	83.3p					
	1984												

[1] Number of employees, seasonally adjusted for 1, 3, and 6 month spans, on payrolls of 186 private nonagricultural industries.

p = preliminary.

NOTE: Figures are the percent of industries with employment rising. (Half of the unchanged components are counted as rising.) Data are centered within the spans.

Senator JEPSEN. Ms. Norwood, hundreds of thousands of high school and college students work during the Christmas break, and then return to school in January.

Are they counted as a negative in the unemployment figures now?

Ms. NORWOOD. Mr. Chairman, the students are counted just as anyone else is counted who wants to work. When a student meets the rest of the definition, that is, that he is not working, he is looking for work, and he's available for work, he is counted among the unemployed. We have started, as a matter of fact, last month or a month before, to try to get more accurate statistics on the number of students, and we hope that as these data are collected each month and have a chance to mature, so that we can review them, that we will be able to report to you very specifically every month, should you wish it, on the number of students who are on that board.

Senator JEPSEN. I'd like to probe this again, not in a negative sense, but in trying to get a better perspective.

Now college students don't have anyone dependent on them. Historically, for a little pocket money they enter the labor force and are counted as such during the Christmas break and then they go back to school in January. How does this affect these unemployment statistics and figures?

Ms. NORWOOD. Mr. Chairman, of course, there is an effect on the unemployment data and on the unemployment rates by the various groups that make up those who are counted officially as unemployed. Our definition is basically an activity definition. It is based upon those people who are actually telling us, in a household survey, that they want a job, that they're not working, and that they're actually looking for work.

We believe that we in the Bureau of Labor Statistics should not be making a value judgment about whether people need work or do not need work. We do, however, publish, on a regular basis, in table A-5 of our release, a series of unemployment rates, some of which have a much narrower definition than others, and some of which have a wider definition. One could take, for example, the unemployment rate for persons 25 years and over, which excludes, certainly, all of the teenagers and most of the people who are in college. And that rate, which we publish every month, is 6.2 percent. There are many ways of looking at this, and our feeling is that we should provide the public with all the information that we can, so that each person can make his own judgment.

Senator JEPSEN. Well, I have no quarrel with what you're presenting. But in the interest of understanding the data, and especially 1984 being an election year, we need all the perspective we can get, based on facts.

What I just heard you say is that the unemployment rate for people over age 25 in this country is 6.2 percent.

Ms. NORWOOD. That's correct.

Senator JEPSEN. What was it 6 months ago for people over age 25?

Ms. NORWOOD. Well, in the second quarter of 1983, it was 7.9 percent. That's in our table A-5.

Senator JEPSEN. I'll just try one more time, and I'm not faulting your answers which you've given.

Ms. NORWOOD. I understand.

Senator JEPSEN. I don't have it fixed in my mind yet.

Can you tell me, are there, in the figures that you gave today, where you said there are approximately 250,000 more people employed today than there were 30 days ago—is that correct?

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes.

Senator JEPSEN. Did that figure include an adjustment which would be, of course, a negative adjustment for all of those college students who were working over the Christmas holidays and went back to school?

Ms. NORWOOD. The figures that we are presenting to you today on a seasonally adjusted basis provide an adjustment for that which we normally expect for all workers, both college students, high school students, and adults.

Senator JEPSEN. It does include that then; is that right?

Ms. NORWOOD. It includes that. All of our figures include students.

Senator JEPSEN. So there could be hundreds and thousands of people reflected in this figure that just simply went to work part time, as normally has been done over the years, and now they're back in school? Do you have a breakdown of the college students?

Ms. NORWOOD. No; we do not have it yet on a monthly basis. We can provide something on the basis of last year for the record. And as I indicated earlier, we have begun collecting these data, and hope that once the data settle down, we will be able to report them.

Senator JEPSEN. In your opinion, does the February data understate employment because high school or college students work part time over the Christmas holidays and then go back to school?

Ms. NORWOOD. I don't think so, Mr. Chairman, because the only way that there could be a problem with those numbers is if there were a substantial change or had been a substantial change this December compared to previous Decembers. Our seasonal adjustment process takes account of this expected movement of people who come into the labor force in December and leave it in January. It's part of the seasonal adjustment process.

Senator JEPSEN. You have always done it this way. The figure here would be as accurate as the one last year, the year before, or 10 years ago?

Ms. NORWOOD. I think what I'm saying, though, is that seasonal adjustment is an imperfect process. It's based on historical experience, and to the extent that this experience remains similar to that of previous years, and I have not seen any evidence that it is very different. The movement of students out of the labor force should not have an effect on it.

Senator JEPSEN. Thank you. Senator Proxmire.

Senator PROXMIRE. That fact is, Ms. Norwood, if you have a high school student who is 16 or 17 years old, he's a junior or senior, full-time student. He wants a job and he can't find a job. He's considered unemployed.

Ms. NORWOOD. That's right.

Senator PROXMIRE. He goes to school full time and wants to work and make some money, and he's counted as unemployed?

Ms. NORWOOD. That's correct.

Senator PROXMIRE. As I look at these figures, if you would refer to your technical information sheet, it shows on the second part of the table, the percent of labor force under unemployment rates. It shows that as far as adult men are concerned, the December–January change, there was only one-tenth of 1 percent drop. As far as adult women are concerned, there was no change at all.

On the other hand, for teenagers, there was a fairly spectacular improvement. Unemployment dropped by seven-tenths of 1 percent. I take it that's statistically significant; is that right?

Ms. NORWOOD. No.

Senator PROXMIRE. It's not?

Ms. NORWOOD. It has to be 1.2 percent.

Senator PROXMIRE. Wow. You just missed. At any rate, that is probably a substantial improvement.

Ms. NORWOOD. It could be; yes.

Senator PROXMIRE. And then for blacks, there was a very sharp improvement of 1.1 percent, and for Hispanics, an improvement of 0.4 percent. I take it, Hispanics would not be statistically significant. How about the blacks? That would be?

Ms. NORWOOD. The overall black rate has to decline by 1 full percentage.

Senator PROXMIRE. So that would be significant?

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes.

Senator PROXMIRE. Well, now, is that because of regional matters and factors, or is this because the blacks and Hispanics are traditionally the last hired? We've had a recovery that's gone on now for more than 1 year, and these people are beginning to make some reasonable progress, as far as black unemployment is concerned.

Ms. NORWOOD. I think it's a whole series of factors, of course. It certainly is geography, in part.

Senator PROXMIRE. There's better improvement in the South.

Ms. NORWOOD. In some areas of the country and then, as I think Mr. Obey pointed out, in some particular parts of the States, we even, in good times, still have pockets of unemployment that are fairly high. We always have had that, and I think that some of it is geographic. Some of it may be a particular skill mix, that is, whether the kinds of jobs that are available and the people who have the skills match. There are a whole lot, as you well know, of reasons.

Senator PROXMIRE. Of course, you don't change the basis for your figures at all. I'm not saying you do. But is the presentation of the seasonal factors somewhat different in this report? You find what the actual change before seasonal adjustment was for unemployment, because as I understand it, there was a seasonal adjustment which was possibly overstated, inasmuch as we have had a very severe winter and very severe weather in December. And the unemployment situation may have been overstated.

Therefore, the improvement in January may have been an overstatement, if we adjust for that in making our seasonal adjustment.

Ms. NORWOOD. As I indicated earlier, unemployment declined after seasonal adjustment. It rose before seasonal adjustment.

Senator PROXMIRE. It rose before seasonal adjustment?

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes.

Senator PROXMIRE. How much was the rise in unemployment?

Ms. NORWOOD. From about 9 million to 9.750. So it's about 750,000.

Senator PROXMIRE. Now, have you had any opportunity, or is there any judgment as to the effect the weather may have had in understating the improvement in employment and unemployment in December and, therefore, the change in January?

Ms. NORWOOD. Obviously, there is always a chance for some error in seasonal adjustment. We know that. It's not a perfect art.

We do not see anything particular this month to indicate any serious problem. The weather this year was about, as I understand it, like the last year's January.

If you look at our table presenting alternative seasonal adjustments for the overall unemployment rate, you will see there's very little difference among the various methods.

Senator PROXMIRE. Let me shift gears quickly. I should say that yesterday the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers urged us to follow a policy of reducing the deficit. Perhaps all of us agree we should do that. Of course, that would mean holding down spending, or cutting spending, and increasing revenues, and in the process, in your judgment, would that be likely to increase unemployment or at least decrease the drop in unemployment?

Ms. NORWOOD. Well, obviously, it would depend upon how it would be done.

Senator PROXMIRE. Can you conceive of a way we could do that that wouldn't slow down the recovery, and if so, could you tell me what it is?

Ms. NORWOOD. Well, I leave that to your good judgment.

Senator PROXMIRE. Well, I take it you can't tell us. You are a fine economist, and you are our expert on unemployment and employment.

You see, one of our problems is that the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers tells us that if we follow this policy it will diminish unemployment.

I am all for it. I think we have to grit our teeth, and close our eyes, and get into it, and recognize it is going to be miserable. It is going to be a tough period of adjustment.

Can you see any basis on which we could assume that we could cut Federal spending and increase Federal revenues and not increase unemployment?

Ms. NORWOOD. Well, Senator Proxmire, I try very hard to live within the Federal budget that is given to my agency, and I am not really very expert at the broader picture.

Senator PROXMIRE. Well, you have two fine experts with you, Mr. Plewes and Mr. Dalton. Could they help us with that?

Ms. NORWOOD. I don't think so.

Senator PROXMIRE. That is pretty discouraging because we are all very determined to follow a policy, and we don't even know whether or not this will increase unemployment, and all the economic evidence we have had in the past says it will. But now we have the chairman saying it won't.

Well, now, can you tell me, Ms. Norwood—you are the one who called to my attention the fact that unemployment has bottomed out to a higher and higher figure in successive recessions.

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes.

Senator PROXMIRE. Can you give us any notion of why that is and what policies we might follow that would enable us to break through that unfortunate experience we have had?

Ms. NORWOOD. I would be happy to try to answer the first part of your question. I think that there clearly have been shifts going on in the economy.

As you well know, the demographic makeup of the labor force has an important effect upon unemployment. For many years we had shifts which brought about a much larger group of young people who also have very much higher unemployment rates than others, and they probably always will have because they change jobs more frequently as they are getting experience and move in and out of the labor force.

We have also had an increasing proportion of minority workers, who tend to have a much harder time in the labor force. There are, of course, macroeconomic policy reasons, and there are lots of disagreements about that.

There is a whole literature, as you know, on what is a full employment, a noninflationary full employment rate, and I have nothing particular to add to that literature except to point out to you that there is a lot of disagreement about it.

Senator PROXMIRE. My time is up.

Can you repeat once more what the actual level of unemployment is, not seasonally adjusted?

Ms. NORWOOD. The unemployment, not seasonally adjusted, is——

Senator PROXMIRE. That would tell us the number of people out of work in this country now.

Ms. NORWOOD [continuing]. 9,750,000.

Senator PROXMIRE. Thank you.

Senator JEPSEN. Congressman Lungren.

Representative LUNGREN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Janet, it is good to see you back here with some good news for us.

In your testimony, you mentioned that "Since the recession trough in November 1982, civilian employment has increased by 4.2 million."

Is that seasonally adjusted?

Ms. NORWOOD. No, sir.

Representative LUNGREN. Why is that figure not seasonally adjusted?

Ms. NORWOOD. We could calculate it for you. We will submit it for the record.

[The following information was subsequently supplied for the record:]

The increase in civilian employment from November 1982 to January 1984, before seasonal adjustment was 1,891,000.

Representative LUNGREN. I think you told us last month it was about 5.5 million. The only reason I bring that up is that if we are going to deal with apples and oranges we ought to deal with both

the employment and unemployment side, and do a seasonal adjustment for your employment growth as well as for your unemployment figure.

And if we are going to compare the nonseasonally adjusted unemployment figure, it would be interesting to have the nonseasonally adjusted employment growth figure.

The employment population ratio—did that change from last month?

Ms. NORWOOD. No; it is at 58.8 percent.

Representative LUNGREN. How does that compare with the trough for the recession?

Ms. NORWOOD. It is higher, considerably higher. It was 57.2 percent in November 1982. It is now 58.8 percent.

Representative LUNGREN. So that would at least be another indication that the figures you give us in terms of the improvement on the unemployment picture are real. We have some hard data here.

Ms. NORWOOD. I like to think they are real.

Representative LUNGREN. We have hard data here on a number of indices that we have had true employment growth in this country as well as a drop in the unemployment rate, correct?

Ms. NORWOOD. I think everyone would agree with that. During this recovery period, we have had significant employment growth and a significant decline in unemployment.

Representative LUNGREN. I just want to make it clear it is not just some magic we are doing with seasonal adjustment to give us a phony picture.

What is the automobile unemployment rate now—automobile worker unemployment rate?

Ms. NORWOOD. That is down considerably this month, to 6.4 percent.

Representative LUNGREN. And what was that at the trough of the recession?

Ms. NORWOOD. Well, at the trough of the recession it was 24.2 percent.

Senator JEPSEN. Would you repeat that, please?

Ms. NORWOOD. 24.2 percent in November 1982.

Senator JEPSEN. What is it now?

Ms. NORWOOD. It is 6.4 percent.

Now, remember, these are people who say that their last job was in the automobile industry. There may be people who were unemployed autoworkers who found jobs outside of the auto industry and then became unemployed again. They would not be reported as unemployed autoworkers.

Representative LUNGREN. And you indicated to us that the figure still does not put us close to what the historical high of autoworkers was. There has been a trend in which we have a smaller universe of autoworkers employed and unemployed to work with now, correct?

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes; the employment level in the automobile industry, which has picked up considerably during the recovery and is in fact above the level that it was at the beginning of the recession, is still considerably below the level that it was in 1979.

Representative LUNGREN. So that is somewhat consistent with your figures that you mentioned about manufacturing jobs, that we

have reached somewhat of a plateau in terms of growth in manufacturing jobs and the greater growth we see in jobs is in the nonmanufacturing sector, is that correct?

Ms. NORWOOD. I wouldn't want to call it a plateau. I think what is happening is there is an increase in manufacturing employment, but the recovery has yet to return in manufacturing to its pre-recession peak. And a great deal of the employment growth is occurring in the service-producing sector.

Representative LUNGREN. So the manufacturing sector isn't the leader as it has been in the past in terms of job growth as we come through the recovery, is that correct?

Ms. NORWOOD. During the recovery employment in manufacturing has regained about 54 percent of what it was during the recession.

Representative LUNGREN. And the figure you have for total employment, civilian employment, is over 4 million now?

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes; 103 million is a record level for civilian employment.

Representative LUNGREN. That is the largest we have ever hit?

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes.

Representative LUNGREN. OK. That would be reflected in the figures you gave us for the improvement in total jobs since the trough of the recession.

Can you tell us how many States we have that are still in double-digit unemployment figures?

Ms. NORWOOD. Just a moment.

Representative LUNGREN. And how that compares with the trough of the recession?

Mr. PLEWES. In November 1983, the latest data we have for all States, there were 12 States that had 10 percent or above.

Representative LUNGREN. How does that compare with the trough, which I guess is what we are referring to as November, the previous year?

Ms. NORWOOD. We don't have those data here. It is considerably less.

Mr. PLEWES. About 30 States.

Ms. NORWOOD. We can supply that for the record.

[The following information was subsequently supplied for the record:]

DOUBLE-DIGIT UNEMPLOYMENT FIGURES IN STATES

In November 1982, 20 States plus the District of Columbia had unemployment rates of 10 percent or higher.

Senator JEPSEN. Congressman OBEY.

Representative OBEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Ms. Norwood, I think for as long as I have known you, you have probably, as much as any other official in government, been synonymous with the word "competence." I think your response to Senator Proxmire's question earlier also indicates that you are synonymous with the word "careful."

I would like to follow up on Congressman Lungren's last question.

You indicated that the last figures available indicated that there had been 12 States which were still in double-digit unemployment.

Can you tell which ones they are?

Ms. NORWOOD. West Virginia, Alabama, Michigan, Ohio, the District of Columbia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Oregon, Kentucky, Washington, Alaska, and Indiana.

Representative OBEY. What were the last four?

Ms. NORWOOD. Kentucky, Washington, Alaska, and Indiana.

Representative OBEY. Thank you.

How many are still above 9 percent?

Ms. NORWOOD. We will have to count that. I didn't expect that question, and so I have to do a counting.

Representative OBEY. Do you have any idea which ones they are?

Ms. NORWOOD. Wisconsin is 8.9. It is practically there.

Mr. PLEWES. The following States had an unemployment rate of 9 percent or more in November 1983: Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, the District of Columbia, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Mississippi, New Mexico, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Washington, and West Virginia.

Representative OBEY. And Wisconsin at 8.9?

Mr. PLEWES. 8.9.

Representative OBEY. Thank you.

What percentage of the unemployed are covered by unemployment insurance?

Ms. NORWOOD. If you include all benefits, total unemployment insurance as a percentage of total unemployment is 39 percent.

Representative OBEY. So more than 6 out of 10 are not covered. How would that compare with a similar point in the recovery after the 1975 recession?

Ms. NORWOOD. It was 67 percent then, and it is 39 now.

Representative OBEY. So almost 7 out of 10?

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes; but that was in May 1975.

Representative OBEY. OK.

Ms. NORWOOD. So we don't have the period of recovery there.

Representative OBEY. So the months are skewed a little bit, but basically you are saying that——

Ms. NORWOOD. If you take 1979, it is 33.

Representative OBEY [continuing]. So what you are saying is that the last time that we had a major recession—let's put it this way—since 1975 the situation has changed in terms of people falling through the cracks, so that in contrast to 6 out of 10 who are falling through the cracks today you had, in May 1975, only about 3½, with the benefit of the doubt, for every 10 who were uncovered, is that right?

Ms. NORWOOD. I think, Congressman Obey, that perhaps a little better comparison, since May 1975 was in the middle of the recession, would be to go back to 1982 in the recession when it was about 47 percent.

Still considerably lower, yes, you are right. It is considerably lower.

Representative OBEY. I understand it. The fact is there were a number of changes made both before this administration came in and since they have been here. I am not trying to get at the question of who is responsible. I am trying to measure what I am asking. I am not asking about 1982; I am asking about 1975. The shape of the law was considerably different then.

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes.

Representative OBEY. That is the answer I am looking for.

Can you give us a profile or give us some idea of the composition of that group of people who have been unemployed for 6 months or longer? What is that group?

Ms. NORWOOD. They are about 67 percent men and 33 percent women. Almost half—48 percent—are 25 to 44 years old.

Representative OBEY. Forty-eight percent are 25 to 44 years of age?

Ms. NORWOOD. That is right. A quarter of them are black.

Representative OBEY. And what industries or what kinds of work?

Ms. NORWOOD. Well, about 30 percent are manufacturing, most of those in durable manufacturing, about 17 percent in wholesale and retail trade, and about 10 percent in construction.

Representative OBEY. Ten percent in construction. Thank you.

I have some other substantive questions, but I would like to put on my other hat for a moment, the appropriations hat, and just ask you a question about your budget.

As I understand it, your budget is being about level funded in the last year, is that right?

Ms. NORWOOD. It is a level program budget. There is an increase in funding for space, telephone, and travel, and a number of other things, and there is also an increase that will show up because of a transfer of trust funds. But in terms of programs it is level except for an increase for the CPI Division program.

Representative OBEY. One last question. Are there any efforts that you would like to be pursued that you think would be useful in providing us with information which you are not going to be able to pursue under that budget?

Ms. NORWOOD. That is a wonderful question to ask to the head of any agency.

Let me just say——

Representative OBEY. Oh, no, I mean, in all seriousness, because the numbers you provide, the numbers some other agencies provide give us the guts of the information on which we need to make the decisions or at least understand what is happening.

Ms. NORWOOD. Let me just say, Congressman Obey, I am pleased that we have been able to start on the modernization of the hourly earnings and the monthly employment establishment survey that I am reporting to you here; that is, there is an increment that was provided some years ago that we are working on.

I am pleased that we have underway the redesign of the Current Population Survey and that we have begun work on the revision of the Consumer Price Index, which will take some years to complete.

Obviously, there are many other things that we would like to be doing. I guess my major concerns are in two areas.

One is that as the economy becomes oriented much more toward a service-producing sector I think that the statistical agencies throughout the Government need to be looking at the improvement of data on services.

And the second area that gives me some concern, and in which we are trying to do some work, is to improve our quality control. That tends to be expensive, and I find that the Congress doesn't

like it too much and neither does anyone else because it doesn't produce new output. It just produces better output.

I am concerned about the quality of the data that we have, and we are trying our best to improve it.

Representative OBEY. My time has expired. Thank you.

Senator JEPSEN. Senator Abdnor.

Senator ABDNOR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Ms. Norwood, it is always good to have you come before us, particularly with the kind of statistics you have been reporting the last few months. It is always pleasant to hear about improvements. It is that much better if we can bring in all those good figures. These are an important reflection of the economic recovery and the condition of our country.

Now, many analysts use unemployment insurance initial claims as a way to project movements in the unemployment rate.

Now, is that pretty consistent? How consistent is the relationship between unemployment insurance initial claims with the unemployment rate?

Ms. NORWOOD. There is, of course, a very strong relationship between the total unemployed, as we define them officially, and those people who have eligibility for unemployment insurance claims. But from time to time, and particularly in recent years, that relationship has not worked as comfortably as it did in the past.

Senator ABDNOR. Why?

Ms. NORWOOD. For a number of reasons, I think. Partly, I think, because of some changes that Congress legislated in the law, partly because of some administrative changes that have been made to administer the unemployment insurance laws better, partly because the 1981–82 recession followed on the 1980 recession with just a very short period of recovery, and so some people had used up their benefits.

There are a whole lot of reasons for it.

Senator ABDNOR. Well, you have described a general statement that for every 1 percent drop we have in unemployment that means $25 or $30 million off the budget deficit.

Is that a reasonable statement, or is that a political statement?

Ms. NORWOOD. I am certain that unemployment causes problems for the budget that can be related to dollars. But the specifics of that I am not at all familiar with.

I think the Congressional Budget Office does a pretty good job of making these types of estimates.

Senator ABDNOR. Well, I probably will come to that, but if there is a meaningful figure it is certainly a big improvement and good to have that kind of a change take place.

You have noted the unemployment rate has fallen quite rapidly during this recovery. How does it compare with the recoveries occurring since the 1950's?

Ms. NORWOOD. If we look at the drop in terms of the percentage decline in the level of unemployment, which is the only way we can look at it since the rates have been different, this drop in the level of unemployment has been greater than in any period back into the late 1950's.

If we look at it in terms of the unemployment rate, which of course then takes into account the labor force as well, it has been a sharper drop than in any period since 1950.

Senator ABDNOR. If we can sustain that, we are that much better off.

I am from South Dakota. Are you able to measure and disaggregate unemployment in the more rural communities, cities with populations of 5,000 and under? I mean, do you have a breakdown among the unemployed, black, youth, women, and men, et cetera, for the rural States?

Ms. NORWOOD. It is very difficult for us to develop unemployment estimates with any real accuracy for very small areas of the country. It is particularly difficult for us to develop unemployment data for rural areas because there is so much seasonal employment and unemployment when people work on farms.

We do have a program to measure unemployment for cities of 50,000 or more, as well as for counties. We think that is too small to get data for accuracy.

We do have data, of course, at the State level, and for South Dakota we have South Dakota and Sioux Falls, but that is all, and they are relatively low rates, under 5 percent.

Senator ABDNOR. See, this is getting off the subject a bit maybe, but your figures are used sometimes as a formula for different distribution of different programs around here. Supposedly, they help the unemployed in the depressed areas.

You go into States like mine where the people are practically all self-employed and the rest of the labor force doesn't really register under your figures. Many times we could be far more depressed than some of the most unemployed areas in the country. It doesn't show up, at least the unemployed. The ones that meet all the tests and the criteria for unemployment are receiving some income, and some of the people in my State and the rural areas are losing dollars by going to work because they don't have any reimbursement coming in.

I have argued a lot of times that sometimes per capita income ought to be given some consideration because you can have a low unemployment and still one of the lowest per capita incomes.

I know people that toss money out of their pockets every time they go to work over the last 4 years just trying to hang on. That is what I was really trying to get at.

In some ways your figures really do not actually tell the real, real story of the impact of the economy in the various areas of the United States. You just can't rely on unemployment figures alone.

Would you say that is kind of correct?

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes; I do say that is correct. I would rephrase it a bit, however.

Senator ABDNOR. Yes.

Ms. NORWOOD. I think we can rely on the data that we produce, but we ought to recognize the limitations. As we have indicated many times, the smaller the area of the country, the smaller the demographic group as a proportion of the total, the larger the statistical error just by definition unless you oversample enormously. So that is a problem.

A second problem is that people always look at the unemployment rate as though it is a hardship measure, and it is not a hardship measure. It is a measure of essentially the supply of labor that is out there, and then when we get into rural areas it becomes extremely difficult to measure some of the underemployment that clearly exists there.

So it should only be looked at when we look at local areas in relation to a lot of other data.

Senator ABDNOR. Thank you for a good point. I am happy you made it.

Thank you.

Senator JEPSEN. Congressman Mitchell.

Representative MITCHELL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am going to follow your admonition. I am going to demonstrate the power of positive thinking today.

Sure, we have seen a significant drop in the unemployment rate, and that is very good, and I am absolutely convinced that the people now at work are delighted to be out of that devastating, long, contrived recession/depression. That is my positive thinking.

I can't be so positive about blacks and other minorities as has been discussed. The unemployment rate is down to 8 percent, and those who happen to be minorities still live with a 16.7 rate of unemployment.

What would you compare the black youth unemployment with the 8 percent? What is the rate of black youth unemployment?

Ms. NORWOOD. It is 47.9 percent.

Representative MITCHELL. 47.9 percent compared to 8 percent. That is pretty devastating.

Now, please believe me, Ms. Norwood, I am merely trying to find out what the scope of your work can embrace. I have the impression that because of affirmative action we did see some significant gains in employment for blacks and other minorities.

Are you permitted to look at what the impact of the retreat from affirmative action is on blacks and other minorities? Would that fall within the scope of your work?

I am convinced that there is a retreat, and I really don't know whether you would want to measure that as one of the factors affecting minority employment; whether that is in the scope of your jurisdiction.

Ms. NORWOOD. We do not have any data which can relate the specific changes in unemployment to changes in affirmative action.

Representative MITCHELL. No, but I am saying maybe we can get some more money out of the White House for you if that is within the scope of your work.

Ms. NORWOOD. I am not sure how one would measure that. We do not now do it.

Representative MITCHELL. OK.

Ms. NORWOOD. That doesn't mean it can't be done. I have just not thought about how one would do it, what is it that are the specific facts that one could get.

Representative MITCHELL. But would you agree, in general, that an affirmative action program has had a salutary impact on minority unemployment in this country?

Ms. NORWOOD. There certainly has been an increase in minority employment.

Representative MITCHELL. I am a little concerned about the number of part-time workers. Their rate increased very, very slightly, but it did increase.

Why is it that the number of people who are part-time workers involuntarily--they want to work full time, but they can't—why is it that their number would increase?

It seems to me that unemployment falls in a period of recovery, but we have, at least in this month, an increase rather than a decrease. Why is that?

Ms. NORWOOD. The unemployment rate for all part-time workers actually declined.

Representative MITCHELL. That is the group about which I am talking.

Ms. NORWOOD. The number of persons working part-time for economic reasons increased by 230,000. I won't know why that is.

Representative MITCHELL. You don't know why, but that has not been the typical experience in a time of economic recovery, has it?

Ms. NORWOOD. No; it isn't. Of course, it is only one month's data, and I would want to see several months before I concluded there was anything substantive.

Representative MITCHELL. Could you tell me in terms of those who are involuntarily part-time workers for economic reasons—do you have any idea how many hours a week they work? Do they work 20 hours a week or 10 or 15?

Ms. NORWOOD. We don't have any information of that kind with us, but we could provide it, if you would like, for the record.

Representative MITCHELL. I would because I think you get a very, very bad picture if you say here are the number of people who are working part-time involuntarily because of economic reasons. You can say at least they are working, but if they are working only 10 hours a week they are not earning enough to sustain their families.

[The following information was subsequently supplied for the record:]

In January 1984, persons who were at work part-time for economic reasons and usually work full time averaged 23.9 weekly hours. For those who usually work part-time weekly hours averaged 20.6. Of all persons at work part-time for economic reasons, about 18 percent worked less than 15 hours, 52 percent worked 15–29 hours, and 30 percent worked 30–34 hours.

Representative MITCHELL. Let me pursue something that Congressman Obey raised, whether you have the wherewithal to do the job that you want to do, and I am going to probe real hard.

You are too good. I have tried for too many years to get hard answers out of you on such things. Are you getting accurate information on the number of people who have exhausted all of their unemployment compensation benefits? Do you have an accurate figure in your latest statistics on that?

Ms. NORWOOD. No, we don't because we don't have any jurisdiction over the data that come out of the actual unemployment insurance system. That is not a Bureau of Labor Statistics responsibility.

The Congress did request in the 1984 budget that we look at the question of the development of information on mass layoff, and we are to report to the Congress, I think in March, about that.

We are doing some pilot work to look at how that might be done through the use of unemployment insurance records. Then of course one could always take that a step further and find out more about the unemployed.

Representative MITCHELL. Do you have the resources to do a quality job?

Ms. NORWOOD. That is not a program that we have. We were asked to investigate the cost and report to the Congress, and we will do that.

Representative MITCHELL. One last thought from this very positive-thinking-oriented Member of Congress this morning, and that is the long-term unemployed.

It seems to me that as a general rule, when we have had a recovery, the long-term unemployed benefit, but that is not happening at the present time. From the data that you have presented us this morning, the number of people unemployed for longer than 26 weeks was 2 million in January from 2.1 million in December, which is not an appreciable drop.

How do you explain that? Why are long-term unemployed people not benefiting from the so-called economic recovery?

Ms. NORWOOD. I think if we look at this over the period of the recovery, there has been a significant decline. It is obviously not as large as most people would like, but is about in line proportionately with the changes in that group in previous recoveries.

Representative MITCHELL. In past recoveries?

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes. OK. It is just that everything is higher.

Representative MITCHELL. Everything is harder?

Ms. NORWOOD. Higher.

Representative MITCHELL. My time has expired. Thank you, Senator.

Senator JEPSEN. Thank you, Congressman.

I would like to follow up some of the questions of Congressman Mitchell with regard to your data.

The January 1984 issue of the Monthly Labor Review contained an article on the underground economy and BLS statistical data.

What were the main conclusions of this article regarding the accuracy of employment data, and how likely is it that the CPI data have been distorted by underground economic activity?

Ms. NORWOOD. The purpose of that article was to review the criticisms and the estimates that had been made of the people who were missed or might have been missed in all of the BLS surveys.

The result of our review of these estimates was that when examined in the light of the definitions of our surveys and the way in which our surveys are carried out, those estimates did not stand up.

Now, I cannot go further and say we are certain there is no problem. We are continually vigilant about this. We feel that we need to do a lot of testing and quality control, and we are trying to do some of those things.

All that I can tell you is that our review of all the estimates that have been made showed that the specifics of those estimates have

been made generally without knowledge of the specific procedures that we use. And that is essentially the conclusion of that article.

Senator JEPSEN. The unemployment rate of adult women was significantly below that of adult men in much of 1982 and early 1983.

Has this relationship changed much in the recent months?

Ms. NORWOOD. There has been a gap between the two, and you are quite right that the men have had a higher unemployment rate. That gap has been reduced considerably during the recovery period, in large part, I think, because the big job losses during the recession were suffered by adult men, and the biggest job gains during the recovery have been for adult men.

So those rates are now very close together. The men still have a higher unemployment rate, 7.3 percent, but the unemployed rate for adult women is quite close, at 7.1 percent.

Senator JEPSEN. Real average weekly earnings have apparently increased by 2 percent in 1983.

How does this compare with the previous 3 or 4 years, and what does this mean to the average American worker?

Ms. NORWOOD. Clearly, the average hourly earnings figures, when adjusted for the Consumer Price Index, show an upward trend now, and they had been declining before, in large part, of course, because our price statistics are showing marked deceleration; the Consumer Price Index of all urban consumers over the last year has risen by only 3.8 percent. That compares to something like 12 percent in 1979–80.

Senator JEPSEN. Would your department happen to have a combination of what the results would be due to the purchasing power, due to the dramatic drop of inflation plus the tax cut plus the increase of weekly earnings?

Ms. NORWOOD. No, sir.

Senator JEPSEN. You haven't put that kind of thing together. I guess it would be quite dramatic.

In the previous months, you have described the recovery in employment additions as robust and widespread.

Do you still feel the same way about it?

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes. I think for the 14 months of this recovery we have had extraordinarily good employment growth.

Senator JEPSEN. Senator Proxmire.

Senator PROXMIRE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Ms. Norwood, you have been questioned already by Congressman Obey and Congressman Mitchell about your budget and the effect it would have on your operations. I want to be a little more explicit than I think they were. I am not sure if they covered this.

Will any statistical programs be curtailed or delayed because of the budget that the present system has?

Ms. NORWOOD. You will recall, Senator Proxmire, that in fiscal 1982 we eliminated 19 programs. Since that time we have added basically one program, which is the beginning of the CPI revision.

That program was in the fiscal 1984 budget. It will be in the fiscal 1985 budget. It is in the fiscal 1985 present submission, and we hope, of course, that we will have that.

Senator PROXMIRE. There are sharp cuts in that, are there not?

Ms. NORWOOD. We hope that it will be adequate to do the job. I should point out that the Consumer Price Index Revision Program

is probably better than anyone else's and is an extremely complex undertaking.

It is going to be very tight. We think we can do it. We are concerned, and we are watching that program with great, great care.

Senator PROXMIRE. How about the reductions in ETA? I understand that there are large budget reductions for the Employment and Training Administration. Will they incur the quality of your data in your testimony?

Ms. NORWOOD. The arrangements that were made in fiscal 1984 and then carried through further in fiscal 1985 provide for essentially a transfer, either through a transfer into our budget or trust funds, for the statistical programs that had formerly been jointly funded by ETA and the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

We have the funds for the statistical programs that were jointly funded and I do not see that there is any problem with them. The only program that is not a part of that group of transferred funds is the administrative data that comes out of the unemployment insurance system, the tax system, which we call the ES-202, which is a tremendously important program because it feeds into the national economic accounts, as well as for a variety of other reasons.

We are working with the Employment and Training Administration to try to be certain that there are adequate funds for that.

I do not see at this point that the Federal/State programs are in any serious difficulty.

Senator PROXMIRE. Very good. Keep us posted on this because, of course, all of us want very much to hold down spending and I am sure you feel the same way. But we want to be sure we get reliable, accurate, comprehensive statistics so we know what you are doing.

This investment, it seems to me, has been a very good investment over the years.

Ms. NORWOOD. I like to think so.

Senator PROXMIRE. Particularly for the 100th anniversary, which you point out it is.

Ms. NORWOOD. If you look at the B tables in our report, I would like to point out to you that there are some further industry breakdowns in the establishment tables. We have, for example, business services and health services.

As I indicated, I think this is the beginning of a step that is really very much needed to do more work in the service sector.

Senator PROXMIRE. I would expect that over time as the employment increases, the unemployment drops, but the rate of overtime may reflect an employer wariness about the duration of the recovery.

Do you expect that these industries reduce overtime and add to employment capacity in the coming months?

Ms. NORWOOD. I don't know. I think that is an important question.

An employer can react by adding working hours, and many of the people that I talk to in private industry tell me about two shifts they have that are working overtime, but they are still keeping some lines closed.

So it is a question of, I think, labor costs and of the employer's decision, having come through the recession, perhaps to try to modernize and make things more concentrated.

Senator PROXMIRE. You don't have confidence that the recovery will continue? Is that part of it? You don't want to hire a new employee, put him on, go through all the training costs, and so on, and then have to lay him off?

Ms. NORWOOD. There may be some of that. There is concern, of course, I think we are seeing some signs of the GNP data perhaps slowing slightly, and then there is always the concern about the deficit.

Senator PROXMIRE. You were asked about part-time work. Within the category of workers who desire but can't obtain full-time jobs, how many work less than 20 hours a week? Do you have any figures on that?

Ms. NORWOOD. We don't have that information with us.[1]

Senator PROXMIRE. The fact that there were so many teenagers, a big increase in teenage employment and very little increase, practically no increase in adult employment, suggests to me that there should have been a big recovery in the service areas, but you say that about one-third of the jobs have been added since the trough of the recession in the service industries.

Where is the other two-thirds?

Ms. NORWOOD. Some of it, of course, is in manufacturing. For example, autos, lumber and wood manufacturing, plastics. There has been a big upturn there.

Some of it is in retail trade.

Senator PROXMIRE. I notice the leather industry is down.

Ms. NORWOOD. Oh, yes, and tobacco is another industry that is down considerably.

Senator PROXMIRE. Down recently. They went down in January?

Ms. NORWOOD. That is right.

For example, the blast furnace and basic steel industry has not recovered any of the loss during the recession; whereas, the lumber and wood products industry has regained 150 percent of the recession loss.

Senator PROXMIRE. Just one more question, Mr. Chairman. I apologize.

In the very depressed employment area, how do pay rates compare with sectors experiencing employment growth? Has there been a shift so that those that have lower level of wages have recovered and those with higher level of wages have not?

Ms. NORWOOD. There are some signs of decreasing wage rates in the industries that are declining. I wouldn't want to make too much of that because the way we have to do this is to look at average hourly earnings, which are also affected by other mix problems.

We could submit a table for the record, however, which would show some of the service-producing industries going up and a few of the others going down, but I think we should be a bit careful about drawing too many conclusions.

Senator PROXMIRE. Thank you.

Senator JEPSEN. Congressman Lungren.

---

[1] See response on p. 41.

Representative LUNGREN. Does the average hourly benefits that you have talked about, earnings that you have talked about—does that include benefits like health insurance benefits?

Ms. NORWOOD. No, sir. The series that we have that can give us a much better fix on what is going on in terms of pay, which I think is the employment cost index, which includes total compensation, and it is done by keeping essentially constant the occupation. So you don't have an occupational mix. You don't have the full-time/part-time mix.

It is a base-weighted index. So you can really see the change. That is really the best series to use, but unfortunately, that does not have large industry detail.

Representative LUNGREN. Commissioner, I would like to congratulate you on the job you are doing in holding down spending. I also like your reluctance to ask for more.

I have never heard anyone suggest that the figures you give us are anything less than competent figures, and I think that is a bipartisan feeling.

I like your statement that you concentrate so much on trying to do your job within your budget that you don't have time to think about those that are not. Perhaps if we could have that idea expressed in other parts of the Government, we might be doing pretty well.

One of the important figures—all of the figures you have given us are obviously very important—but I think one of the most important one is figures that I believe Senator Abdnor was talking about with you, that we had 2 percent increase in real weekly earnings this past year.

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes.

Representative LUNGREN. And according to the data you have given us, that is the best performance we have had in 11 years.

Ms. NORWOOD. That is right.

Representative LUNGREN. That basically means people are ahead of the curve on inflation with respect to what they are taking home, correct?

Ms. NORWOOD. That is right.

Representative LUNGREN. I hope that is not lost in the testimony here because I think that is extremely important.

In your testimony today, and in other months, you have always talked to us about important demographic changes and suggest we should take those into consideration when evaluating this evidence.

You have talked to us today about what appears to be a substantial decrease in teenagers in the job market, and you indicated that you have an expectation that this trend will continue.

I wonder if this is going to create some potential problems down the line for the question of the armed services and the pool that we have to pull from.

In that regard how dramatic is this change in demographics with respect to teenagers?

I don't know how you evaluate it on a percentage basis or what criteria you would use, but what type of criteria would you think is appropriate?

How would you describe the demographic changes we are seeing now with respect to teenagers?

Ms. NORWOOD. It is quite clear that birth rates dropped as the post World War II baby boom ended.

It is also clear that there have been differences in the makeup of the population because the birth rates of some groups declined less than the birth rates of other groups. As those youngsters grow up, we will find fewer of them and we also will be finding a very different racial makeup.

Minorities will comprise a larger proportion of the new entrants to the labor force than they did in the past because their birth rates declined less than the white birth rate.

So I think there are a number of factors there that certainly need to be considered.

Representative LUNGREN. I guess one way of asking would be to determine what the pool of teenagers has been or the pool of those teenagers who at least have an opportunity to decide whether they want to join the Armed Forces are in terms of numbers.

Are we going to see a tremendous diminution in the number of teenagers in that pool?

Ms. NORWOOD. We are having now a diminution in the numbers of teenagers coming into the work force, and that is because there will be a smaller population of teenagers for the next several years. It is a significant decline, and it will continue for several years.

Of course, later it will turn around again.

Representative LUNGREN. I want to make this clear—do you see anything to suggest that the labor force trend that you mentioned, the slowdown of women and teenagers entering into the job force will change in total in this year or for next year?

Ms. NORWOOD. The teenage group certainly will not. The labor force participation rates for women may well pick up a bit as the economy continues to improve. They probably will not return to the very rapid rates of increase that we had during the 1960's and the 1970's, but I expect they will again pick up a bit.

Representative LUNGREN. Thank you.

Ms. NORWOOD. Congressman Lungren, may I just say that I appreciate the comments you made about my response to the budget. I would certainly like the record to show that I support the President's budget for the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

I would also like the record to show that I believe strongly in the need for quality control and for using our resources efficiently to try to develop more and better data.

Representative LUNGREN. I understand that, and I wish we could have your same feeling about quality control to prevail over here in the House in terms of our legislation.

Senator JEPSEN. Ms. Norwood, I would like to explore that 6.2 percent employed of those over age 25. I was quite taken with that statistic.

What would be the percentage figure that would represent what you consider to be structurally unemployed in that age group?

Ms. NORWOOD. I can't put any particular number on that or any percentage on it. I think we need to be concerned about people who are unemployed, and especially those who are not able to find work over a long period of time.

We have a dynamic labor market in this country, and people are always changing and moving. Some people are always changing

jobs. They leave jobs, they lose jobs, and they find others. People also enter the labor force after a period of absence or for the first time.

Clearly, the 2 million people who have been unemployed for 6 months or more, the so-called long-term unemployed, are having serious difficulties.

Many of our minority workers who may be geographically located in areas where jobs are not available or who have skills that are somewhat different from those that are required for the jobs that are open are having difficulty.

There are still a number of displaced workers, that is, those who have lost jobs and who have not found other jobs to replace them. We are doing a special survey to attempt to quantify this group and learn more about them.

There are still a number of those people, and the job losses have been primarily in the goods-producing sector. Job gains during the recovery have been about equal in the goods and service producing sectors.

So there may be a training and a skill-mix problem.

Senator JEPSEN. You do not have a figure for the structural unemployment of those under age 25?

Ms. NORWOOD. No, sir.

Senator JEPSEN. Do you have a figure for what is considered to be full employment?

Ms. NORWOOD. No. I leave that to the researchers and to the policymakers to discuss. Clearly, that rate varies, depending upon the particular views of the individual, anywhere from 4 percent to 7 or 8 percent.

Senator JEPSEN. According to other people, then, somewhere between 4 and 8 percent could be construed as being full employment in this country when you take into consideration those who are handicapped, those who are structurally unemployed.

Is that what you are saying?

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes.

Senator JEPSEN. That is the range now, and you don't get into that at all, examining it at all? How can you reflect people who are unemployed in this country on the basis of "want to be unemployed"? Wouldn't this affect the number if not definition of structural unemployment?

Ms. NORWOOD. The definition of "structural unemployment" is the problem. Clearly, the economic literature suggests, there is always going to be some frictional unemployment out there, as people change jobs, even voluntarily, or decide to enter or reenter the labor force in search of work.

The exact definition for "structural unemployment" I find difficult to come up with. We can tell you about the number of people who are unemployed in an objective way, who actually have told us that they are looking for jobs. They report that a job search has taken place.

And that is, I think, important because it is a much more objective measure than if we or anyone else were to decide that this person is in the structural group but another person is not.

One of the things, Mr. Chairman, that we have tried to do is to emphasize the need to look at the entire body of data that is in our

release, and the release has a lot of numbers in it. There is a reason for that.

The reason is that a single number cannot tell the whole story. We really need to look at what is happening to individual groups of the population, and I think you are quite right in pointing out that we need to look at many of these much more carefully.

Senator JEPSEN. You can pick up a paper any given day and go to the want ads and find page after page after page after page after page of jobs. We have all heard stories about working the system, where people have gone and applied for a job to meet the qualifications of some of the programs that require they have looked for another job.

I know in my State I have numerous business people who have advised me that they cannot find people to do the work that they need done, and they have people come in who are unemployed and have been sent there by employment agencies or job services, whatever it may be, and they come in and they visit without a real interest of working, but only to qualify for relief programs. Though they are a minority of the unemployed, they are included in the statistics, aren't they?

Ms. NORWOOD. Anyone who is not working, is available for work, and has searched for work during the preceding 4 weeks of the survey is included in our data.

Senator JEPSEN. So those people are included in your data because they have gone out. They have done their thing, so to speak. They have made their one contact, and for right now they have tried to find work, and that work isn't suitable and doesn't pay what they would like, especially since they have a combination of government programs. So they prefer not to work.

Those are included in the unemployment statistics?

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes.

Senator JEPSEN. Well, let's go to another area, and that is in this new growth that is taking place. Among many positive dynamics that are taking place in this economic recovery is the fact that we have hundreds of thousands of new businesses starting every week.

My understanding is that your household survey and establishment survey would at some point in time pick up these folks that were employed in these new businesses, but there is a lag time there.

When would employees of these firms, these new businesses—of which we have more than we have ever had at any point in time in our history—be picked up and included and reflected in your statistics as being employed?

Ms. NORWOOD. I think the important point to remember, Mr. Chairman, is that they are reflected in the household survey as soon as they become employed, and it is the establishment survey that is a survey of business establishments.

Senator JEPSEN. That is what I said.

Ms. NORWOOD. There is a lag in the establishment survey in obtaining information on new firm formation. The difference this month between the household survey and the payroll survey is somewhat narrower than it has been before, but the 4.2 million growth in employment that we have been talking about, is based upon the household survey where there is no lag.

Senator JEPSEN. So that knowing full well that this phenomenon is taking place, where we have a dramatic, dynamic increase in the new businesses and it is literally starting to explode, so to speak, those new jobs that you list in those numbers would be considerably greater than what you have but you don't know how long.

Is it 1 month, 2 months, 3 months?

Ms. NORWOOD. First of all, you are quite right that there is some lag in picking up new establishments in the business survey.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics recognizes that, and we do have a statistical method for adjusting for that, what we call a "new birth bias" that might exist in the survey. Obviously, no statistical adjustment can be perfect, and there may be some lag still there, but we do attempt to adjust for it.

I think the important thing in looking at that issue, however, is to recognize that we have two totally independent surveys that are measuring employment and that the household survey does not have any birth of establishment problem with it.

That is the one that is showing the 4 million jobs that have been created during the recovery. The establishment survey is showing somewhat less.

On the other hand, the establishment survey, which is based on payrolls, does not include the self-employed and a few other groups.

Senator JEPSEN. Would it be correct to say that the differences caused by this birthing phenomenon that you talked about will continue so long as the economy continues to expand at the solid rate that it currently is?

Is the formula with the adjustment mechanism that you are using to try to gauge this been fine tuned in light of the tremendous explosion of new businesses that have been opening up now?

This figure may be a little dated, but in the last 18 months or so we have had over 800,000 new businesses formed. It is rather spectacular.

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes, sir.

The answer to your question is yes. Of course, we keep watching these developments, and we do review our adjustment factors on a regular basis and make changes at special times that are understood and known because we have to be a very open organization and let people know what we are doing.

And at the period when we benchmark the data, we have a better opportunity to see where they are. We have done very well.

I would point out, when we go back and look at the data that we have produced in the past and compare them to the benchmark levels of the total after the fact, we find that we have been extremely close.

In addition, as I pointed out, we have the added safeguard that there is no problem of new establishments in the household survey because we are going out to people asking people whether they are working or not.

We are not going to establishment. We are not asking them whether it is a new establishment or an old establishment.

So we are lucky in the sense that we have two independent surveys. The household survey is always higher than the establishment survey, in part because of definitional differences, people like the self-employed who have increased enormously during this re-

covery, but also because there is no lag in picking up new establishments.

So I think that in terms of the total statistical package that we present each month we cover this pretty well.

Representative LUNGREN. We went into this little bit last month. You have said that the difference between the two surveys has narrowed. Is that a result of any fine tuning or adjustments that you folks have made, or is that the result of a different phase of the recovery, or is there an answer at this point as to why that would narrow?

Ms. NORWOOD. I think there are several answers. It is not due to fine tuning because we don't fine tune data.

Representative LUNGREN. With regard to the birthing phenomenon is there some adjustment you make to try and better pick it up, or do you just accept the fact that you can't pick it up with the establishment survey initially and, just realize that when you put those figures out?

Ms. NORWOOD. Congressman Lungren, there is a statistical process and procedure that is an established procedure. It is looked at and changed, if it needs to be changed, only once a year. It is done at a specified time so that everybody will know what we are doing.

We must be certain that any statistical methodology that we use is announced and people understand it.

I think what we can do is to say that there has been, for example, an increase between December 1982 and this month of January 1984. There has been an increase of 500,000 or so in the number of people who are self-employed. They would be, by definition, excluded from the establishment survey.

Agricultural workers and private household workers are excluded, as are people who are on strike, and persons with unpaid absences. By definition these groups are excluded from the business survey.

We feel that we can explain most of the differences. There may be differences of a few hundred thousand differences over this 14-month period, which is, I would point out, a very small number.

We also, as we have discussed before, must recognize that there is some sampling variability in the household survey, but the two surveys over the long run tend to track reasonably well once you account for these differences in definition.

Senator JEPSEN. Ms. Norwood, the CPI plus the unemployment rate equals the misery index.

What was the misery index in 1980 compared to the most recent month in which the data is available? Do you have that?

Ms. NORWOOD. We don't calculate an index of that kind. We can supply for the record, if you like, the figures on the CPI and on the unemployment rate for any period that you specify.

Senator JEPSEN. Yes, if you would, and we will ask for it at this point from other sources, too, to see if they all come out the same.

[The following information was subsequently supplied for the record:]

UNEMPLOYMENT RATE, ALL CIVILIAN WORKERS

	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT.	NOV.	DEC.	ANNUAL AVERAGE
ORIGINAL													
1974	5.7	5.8	5.3	4.8	4.6	5.8	5.7	5.3	5.7	5.5	6.2	6.7	5.6
1975	9.0	9.1	9.1	8.6	8.3	9.1	8.7	8.2	8.1	7.8	7.8	7.8	8.5
1976	8.8	8.7	8.1	7.4	6.8	8.0	7.8	7.6	7.4	7.2	7.4	7.4	7.7
1977	8.3	8.5	7.9	6.9	6.4	7.5	7.0	6.8	6.6	6.4	6.5	6.6	7.1
1978	7.1	6.9	6.6	5.8	5.5	6.2	6.3	5.9	5.8	5.4	5.6	5.7	6.1
1979	6.4	6.4	6.1	5.5	5.2	6.0	5.9	5.9	5.7	5.6	5.6	5.7	5.8
1980	6.9	6.8	6.6	6.7	7.1	7.8	7.9	7.6	7.2	7.1	7.1	6.9	7.1
1981	8.2	8.0	7.7	7.0	7.1	7.7	7.3	7.2	7.3	7.5	7.9	8.3	7.6
1982	9.4	9.6	9.5	9.2	9.1	9.8	9.8	9.6	9.7	9.9	10.4	10.5	9.7
1983	11.4	11.3	10.8	10.0	9.8	10.2	9.4	9.2	8.8	8.4	8.1	8.0	9.6
1984	8.3												
SEASONALLY ADJUSTED													
1948	3.4	3.8	4.0	3.9	3.5	3.6	3.6	3.9	3.8	3.7	3.8	4.0	-
1949	4.3	4.7	5.0	5.3	6.1	6.2	6.7	6.8	6.6	7.9	6.4	6.6	-
1950	6.5	6.4	6.3	5.8	5.5	5.4	5.0	4.5	4.4	4.2	4.2	4.3	-
1951	3.7	3.4	3.4	3.1	3.0	3.2	3.1	3.1	3.3	3.5	3.5	3.1	-
1952	3.2	3.1	2.9	2.9	3.0	3.0	3.2	3.4	3.1	3.0	2.8	2.7	-
1953	2.9	2.6	2.6	2.7	2.5	2.5	2.6	2.7	2.9	3.1	3.5	4.5	-
1954	4.9	5.2	5.7	5.9	5.9	5.6	5.8	6.0	6.1	5.7	5.3	5.0	-
1955	4.9	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.3	4.2	4.0	4.2	4.1	4.3	4.2	4.2	-
1956	4.0	3.9	4.2	4.0	4.3	4.3	4.4	4.1	3.9	3.9	4.3	4.2	-
1957	4.2	3.9	3.7	3.9	4.1	4.3	4.2	4.1	4.4	4.5	5.1	5.2	-
1958	5.8	6.4	6.7	7.4	7.4	7.3	7.5	7.4	7.5	6.7	6.2	6.2	-
1959	6.0	5.9	5.6	5.2	5.1	5.0	5.1	5.2	5.5	5.7	5.8	5.3	-
1960	5.2	4.8	5.4	5.2	5.1	5.4	5.5	5.6	5.5	6.1	6.1	6.6	-
1961	6.6	6.9	6.9	7.0	7.1	6.9	7.0	6.6	6.7	6.5	6.1	6.0	-
1962	5.8	5.5	5.6	5.6	5.5	5.5	5.4	5.7	5.6	5.4	5.7	5.5	-
1963	5.7	5.9	5.7	5.7	5.9	5.6	5.6	5.4	5.5	5.5	5.7	5.5	-
1964	5.6	5.4	5.4	5.3	5.1	5.2	4.9	5.0	5.1	5.1	4.8	5.0	-
1965	4.9	5.1	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.1	4.0	-
1966	4.0	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.9	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.6	3.8	-
1967	3.9	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.9	3.8	3.8	3.8	4.0	3.9	3.8	-
1968	3.7	3.8	3.7	3.5	3.5	3.7	3.7	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.4	-
1969	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.7	3.7	3.5	3.5	-
1970	3.9	4.2	4.4	4.6	4.8	4.9	5.0	5.1	5.4	5.5	5.9	6.1	-
1971	5.9	5.9	6.0	5.9	5.9	5.9	6.0	6.1	6.0	5.8	6.0	6.0	-
1972	5.8	5.7	5.8	5.7	5.7	5.7	5.6	5.6	5.5	5.6	5.3	5.2	-
1973	4.9	5.0	4.9	5.0	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.6	4.8	4.9	-
1974	5.1	5.2	5.1	5.1	5.1	5.4	5.5	5.5	5.9	6.0	6.6	7.2	-
1975	8.1	8.1	8.6	8.8	9.0	8.8	8.6	8.4	8.4	8.4	8.3	8.2	-
1976	7.9	7.7	7.6	7.7	7.4	7.6	7.8	7.8	7.6	7.7	7.8	7.8	-
1977	7.5	7.6	7.4	7.2	7.0	7.2	6.9	7.0	6.8	6.8	6.8	6.4	-
1978	6.4	6.3	6.3	6.1	6.0	5.9	6.2	5.9	6.0	5.8	5.9	6.0	-
1979	5.9	5.9	5.8	5.8	5.6	5.7	5.7	6.0	5.9	6.0	5.9	6.0	-
1980	6.3	6.3	6.3	6.9	7.4	7.6	7.8	7.7	7.5	7.5	7.5	7.2	-
1981	7.5	7.4	7.4	7.2	7.4	7.4	7.3	7.4	7.6	7.9	8.3	8.5	-
1982	8.6	8.9	9.0	9.4	9.4	9.5	9.9	9.9	10.2	10.4	10.7	10.7	-
1983	10.4	10.4	10.3	10.2	10.1	10.0	9.5	9.5	9.2	8.8	8.4	8.2	-
1984	8.0												

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Labor
Bureau of Labor Statistics
March 2, 1984

U.S. Department of Labor
Bureau of Labor Statistics
Washington, D.C. 20212

01/24/84

Consumer Price Index

All Urban Consumers - (CPI-U)

U.S. City Average

All items

(1967=100)

YEAR	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG.	SEP.	OCT.	NOV.	DEC.	AVG.	Percent change DEC-DEC	Percent change AVG-AVG
1913	29.4	29.3	29.3	29.4	29.2	29.3	29.6	29.8	29.9	30.1	30.2	30.1	29.7		
1914	30.1	29.8	29.7	29.4	29.6	29.8	30.1	30.5	30.6	30.4	30.5	30.4	30.1	1.0	1.3
1915	30.5	30.1	29.8	30.1	30.2	30.3	30.3	30.3	30.4	30.7	30.9	31.0	30.4	2.0	1.0
1916	31.3	31.3	31.6	31.9	32.0	32.4	32.4	32.8	33.4	33.8	34.4	34.6	32.7	11.6	7.6
1917	35.0	35.8	36.0	37.6	38.4	38.8	38.4	39.0	39.7	40.4	40.5	41.0	38.4	18.5	17.4
1918	41.8	42.2	42.0	42.5	43.3	44.1	45.2	46.0	47.1	47.9	48.7	49.4	45.1	20.5	17.4
1919	49.5	48.4	49.0	49.9	50.6	50.7	52.1	53.0	53.3	54.2	55.5	56.7	51.8	14.8	14.9
1920	57.8	58.5	59.1	60.8	61.8	62.7	62.5	60.7	60.0	59.7	59.3	58.0	60.0	2.3	15.8
1921	57.8	55.2	54.8	54.1	53.1	52.8	52.9	53.1	52.5	52.4	52.1	51.8	53.6	-10.7	-10.7
1922	50.7	50.6	50.0	50.8	50.0	50.1	50.2	49.7	49.8	50.1	50.3	50.5	50.2	-2.5	-6.3
1923	50.3	50.2	50.4	50.6	50.7	51.0	51.5	51.3	51.6	51.7	51.8	51.8	51.1	2.6	1.8
1924	51.7	51.5	51.2	51.0	51.0	51.0	51.1	51.0	51.2	51.4	51.6	51.7	51.2	-.2	.2
1925	51.8	51.6	51.7	51.6	51.8	52.4	53.1	53.1	52.9	53.1	54.0	53.7	52.5	3.9	2.5
1926	53.7	53.5	53.2	53.7	53.4	53.0	52.5	52.2	52.5	52.7	52.9	52.9	53.0	-1.5	1.0
1927	52.5	52.1	51.8	51.8	52.2	52.7	51.7	51.4	51.7	52.0	51.9	51.8	52.0	-2.1	-1.9
1928	51.7	51.2	51.2	51.3	51.6	51.2	51.2	51.3	51.7	51.6	51.5	51.3	51.3	-1.0	-1.3
1929	51.2	51.1	50.9	50.7	51.0	51.2	51.7	51.9	51.8	51.8	51.7	51.4	51.3	.2	.0
1930	51.2	51.0	50.7	51.0	50.7	50.4	49.7	49.4	49.7	49.4	49.0	48.3	50.0	-6.0	-2.5
1931	47.6	46.9	46.6	46.3	45.8	45.3	45.2	45.1	44.9	44.6	44.1	43.7	45.6	-9.5	-8.8
1932	42.8	42.2	42.0	41.7	41.1	40.8	40.8	40.3	40.1	39.8	39.6	39.2	40.9	-10.3	-10.3
1933	38.6	38.0	37.7	37.6	37.7	38.1	39.2	39.6	39.6	39.6	39.6	39.4	38.8	.5	-5.1
1934	39.6	39.9	39.9	39.8	39.9	40.0	40.0	40.1	40.7	40.4	40.3	40.2	40.1	2.0	3.4
1935	40.8	41.1	41.0	41.4	41.2	41.1	40.9	40.9	41.1	41.1	41.3	41.4	41.1	3.0	2.5
1936	41.4	41.2	41.0	41.0	41.0	41.4	41.6	41.9	42.0	41.9	41.9	41.9	41.5	1.2	1.0
1937	42.2	42.3	42.6	42.8	43.0	43.1	43.3	43.4	43.8	43.6	43.3	43.2	43.0	3.1	3.6
1938	42.6	42.2	42.2	42.4	42.2	42.2	42.3	42.2	42.2	42.0	41.9	42.0	42.2	-2.8	-1.9
1939	41.8	41.6	41.5	41.4	41.4	41.4	41.4	41.4	42.2	42.0	42.0	41.8	41.6	-.5	-1.4
1940	41.7	42.0	41.9	41.9	42.0	42.1	42.0	41.9	42.0	42.0	42.0	42.2	42.0	1.0	1.0
1941	42.2	42.2	42.4	42.8	43.1	43.9	44.1	44.5	45.3	45.8	46.2	46.3	44.1	9.7	5.0
1942	46.9	47.3	47.9	48.2	48.7	48.8	49.0	49.3	49.4	49.9	50.2	50.6	48.8	9.3	10.7
1943	50.6	50.7	51.5	52.1	52.5	52.4	52.0	51.8	52.0	52.2	52.1	52.2	51.8	3.2	6.1
1944	52.1	52.0	52.0	52.3	52.5	52.6	52.9	53.1	53.1	53.1	53.1	53.5	52.7	2.1	1.7
1945	53.3	53.2	53.2	53.3	53.7	54.2	54.3	54.3	54.1	54.1	54.3	54.5	53.9	2.3	2.3
1946	54.5	54.3	54.7	55.0	55.3	55.9	59.2	60.5	61.2	62.4	63.9	64.4	58.5	18.2	8.5
1947	64.4	64.3	65.7	65.7	65.5	66.0	66.6	67.3	68.9	68.9	69.3	70.2	66.9	9.0	14.4
1948	71.0	70.4	70.2	71.2	71.7	72.2	73.1	73.4	73.4	73.1	72.6	72.1	72.1	2.7	7.8

U.S. Department of Labor
Bureau of Labor Statistics
Washington, D.C. 20212

01/24/84

Consumer Price Index

All Urban Consumers - (CPI-U)

U.S. City Average

All items

(1967=100)

YEAR	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG.	SEP.	OCT.	NOV.	DEC.	AVG.	Percent change DEC-DEC	Percent change AVG-AVG
1949	72.0	71.2	71.4	71.5	71.4	71.5	71.0	71.2	71.5	71.1	71.2	70.8	71.4	-1.8	-1.0
1950	70.5	70.3	70.6	70.7	71.0	71.4	72.1	72.7	73.2	73.6	73.9	74.9	72.1	5.8	1.0
1951	76.1	77.0	77.3	77.4	77.7	77.6	77.7	77.7	78.2	78.6	79.0	79.3	77.8	5.9	7.9
1952	79.3	78.8	78.8	79.1	79.2	79.4	80.0	80.1	80.0	80.1	80.1	80.0	79.5	.9	2.2
1953	79.8	79.4	79.6	79.7	79.9	80.2	80.4	80.6	80.7	80.9	80.6	80.5	80.1	.6	.8
1954	80.7	80.6	80.5	80.3	80.6	80.7	80.7	80.6	80.4	80.2	80.3	80.1	80.5	-.5	.5
1955	80.1	80.1	80.1	80.1	80.1	80.1	80.4	80.2	80.5	80.5	80.6	80.4	80.2	.4	-.4
1956	80.3	80.3	80.4	80.5	80.9	81.4	82.0	81.9	82.0	82.5	82.5	82.7	81.4	2.9	1.5
1957	82.8	83.1	83.3	83.6	83.8	84.3	84.7	84.8	84.9	84.9	85.2	85.2	84.3	3.0	3.6
1958	85.7	85.8	86.4	86.6	86.6	86.7	86.8	86.7	86.7	86.7	86.8	86.7	86.6	1.8	2.7
1959	86.8	86.7	86.7	86.8	86.9	87.3	87.5	87.4	87.7	88.0	88.0	88.0	87.3	1.5	.8
1960	87.9	88.0	88.0	88.5	88.5	88.7	88.7	88.7	88.8	89.2	89.3	89.3	88.7	1.5	1.6
1961	89.3	89.3	89.3	89.3	89.3	89.4	89.8	89.7	89.9	89.9	89.9	89.9	89.6	.7	1.0
1962	89.9	90.1	90.3	90.5	90.5	90.5	90.7	90.7	91.2	91.1	91.1	91.0	90.6	1.2	1.1
1963	91.1	91.2	91.3	91.3	91.3	91.7	92.1	92.1	92.1	92.2	92.3	92.5	91.7	1.6	1.2
1964	92.6	92.5	92.6	92.7	92.7	92.9	93.1	93.0	93.2	93.3	93.5	93.6	92.9	1.2	1.3
1965	93.6	93.6	93.7	94.0	94.2	94.7	94.8	94.6	94.8	94.9	95.1	95.4	94.5	1.9	1.7
1966	95.4	96.0	96.3	96.7	96.8	97.1	97.4	97.9	98.1	98.5	98.5	98.6	97.2	3.4	2.9
1967	98.6	98.7	98.9	99.1	99.4	99.7	100.2	100.5	100.7	101.0	101.3	101.6	100.0	3.0	2.9
1968	102.0	102.3	102.8	103.1	103.4	104.0	104.5	104.8	105.1	105.7	106.1	106.4	104.2	4.7	4.2
1969	106.7	107.1	108.0	108.7	109.0	109.7	110.2	110.7	111.2	111.6	112.2	112.9	109.8	6.1	5.4
1970	113.3	113.9	114.5	115.2	115.7	116.3	116.7	116.9	117.5	118.1	118.5	119.1	116.3	5.5	5.9
1971	119.2	119.4	119.8	120.2	120.8	121.5	121.8	122.1	122.2	122.4	122.6	123.1	121.3	3.4	4.3
1972	123.2	123.8	124.0	124.3	124.7	125.0	125.5	125.7	126.2	126.6	126.9	127.3	125.3	3.4	3.3
1973	127.7	128.6	129.8	130.7	131.5	132.4	132.7	133.1	133.5	136.6	137.6	138.5	133.1	8.8	6.2
1974	139.7	141.5	143.1	143.9	145.5	146.9	148.0	149.9	151.7	153.0	154.3	155.4	147.7	12.2	11.0
1975	156.1	157.2	157.8	158.6	159.3	160.6	162.3	162.8	163.6	164.6	165.6	166.3	161.2	7.0	9.1
1976	166.7	167.1	167.5	168.2	169.2	170.1	171.1	171.9	172.6	173.3	173.8	174.3	170.5	4.8	5.8
1977	175.3	177.1	178.2	179.6	180.6	181.8	182.6	183.3	184.0	184.5	185.4	186.1	181.5	6.8	6.5
1978	187.2	188.4	189.8	191.5	193.3	195.3	196.7	197.8	199.3	200.9	202.0	202.9	195.4	9.0	7.7
1979	204.7	207.1	209.1	211.5	214.1	216.6	218.9	221.1	223.4	225.4	227.5	229.9	217.4	13.3	11.3
1980	233.2	236.4	239.8	242.5	244.9	247.6	247.8	249.4	251.7	253.9	256.2	258.4	246.8	12.4	13.5
1981	260.5	263.2	265.1	266.8	269.0	271.3	274.4	276.5	279.3	279.9	280.7	281.5	272.4	8.9	10.4
1982	282.5	283.4	283.1	284.3	287.1	290.6	292.2	292.8	293.3	294.1	293.6	292.4	289.1	3.9	6.1
1983	293.1	293.2	293.4	295.5	297.1	298.1	299.3	300.3	301.8	302.6	303.1	303.5	298.4	3.8	3.2

Senator JEPSEN. I thank you, Ms. Norwood, and I want to take this point in time to echo what has been said by my colleagues from both sides of the aisle here today with regard to your steadfast and consistent professionalism.

We have had a national economic headache. It has been a pounding one, and the headache is starting to get better. It is considerably better than it was a year ago. It is considerably better than it was 18 months ago, and both the unemployment figures and all the other indicators that measure the health of the economy for a good number of months now have pointed in the right direction. For the American worker, this is the best economic recovery in the post World War II period.

For your part in the reporting of this particular indicator, I congratulate you and thank you for your professionalism and your consistency. It is most helpful, and I think it is also very good for the image of the "bureaucracy."

Thank you for your good work.

Ms. NORWOOD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator JEPSEN. The committee stands adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 11:30 a.m., the committee adjourned, subject to the call of the Chair.]

EMPLOYMENT-UNEMPLOYMENT

FRIDAY, MARCH 9, 1984

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE,
Washington, DC.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:30 a.m., in room SR-325, Russell Senate Office Building, Hon. Roger W. Jepsen (chairman of the committee) presiding.

Present: Senators Jepsen and Proxmire.

Also present: James K. Galbraith, deputy director; Charles H. Bradford, assistant director; Deborah Clay-Mendez, Robert R. Davis, Christopher J. Frenze, and Paul B. Manchester, professional staff members.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR JEPSEN, CHAIRMAN

Senator JEPSEN. Madam Commissioner, welcome once again to the Joint Economic Committee's monthly hearing on the employment situation. We look forward to your testimony explaining the continued dramatic improvement in labor market conditions.

The main story is that the civilian unemployment rate declined two-tenths of a percentage point to a level of 7.8 percent. The unemployment rate has dropped about 3 percentage points since the end of 1982. The rapid drop in the unemployment rate is the most satisfying aspect of the current economic recovery. Under current policies, America is working again.

I am advised by my staff that the employment growth in this recovery has been robust by historical standards. According to the household survey, in February 700,000 new jobs were created and total civilian employment climbed to 103.9 million, a new record. Total employment is now higher than ever before.

For the American worker this has been the best recovery since World War II. The vigor of this economic expansion has created almost 5 million new jobs so far. The unforeseen strength of this expansion improved labor markets faster than anyone thought possible. Furthermore, the 1.1-percent rise in the composite index of leading economic indicators in January signals continued economic growth and job creation in coming months. While strong economic growth is feared by some, it is essential to the continued welfare of the American worker. It is only through healthy, sustainable economic growth that we can create and maintain enough jobs to employ all Americans seeking work and enforce our own goals: gainful employment for every single person in this country that wants to work.

The employment gains during the recovery period underscore the point that the best jobs programs is an expanding economy. Government policy must continue to make sustained economic expansion its highest priority. Those who support fiscal or monetary measures to slow the economy for one reason or another are asking us to kill the goose that lays the golden egg.

Ms. Norwood, before you proceed, I would like to recognize a very distinguished colleague and, I might add, a most faithful colleague on this committee, Senator Proxmire, who is here to share in the good news.

Senator PROXMIRE. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much.

Senator JEPSEN. Ms. Norwood, you may proceed.

STATEMENT OF HON. JANET L. NORWOOD, COMMISSIONER, BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, ACCOMPANIED BY KENNETH V. DALTON, ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER, OFFICE OF PRICES AND LIVING CONDITIONS, AND JOHN BREGGER, CHIEF, DIVISION OF EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT ANALYSIS

Ms. NORWOOD. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I would first like to introduce Kenneth V. Dalton, Associate Commissioner, Office of Prices and Living Conditions, on my right; and Jack Bregger, who handles the labor force data.

I am always very pleased to come before this committee to offer a few comments to supplement our release.

February produced another round of strong improvements in our Nation's job market. Both employment series showed large gains: household employment advanced by 700,000 and nonfarm payroll jobs grew by almost 400,000. In addition, both the overall unemployment rate and the civilian worker rate declined another two-tenths of a percentage point, to 7.7 and 7.8 percent, respectively. Both were nearly 3 full points below their recession highs.

The highlight of current labor force development continues to be the rapid growth of jobs. The unusally large household survey gains were shared by both adult men and women and by both whites and blacks.

The employment-population ratio, the proportion of the working age population with jobs, is a particularly useful economic indicator. For civilian workers, this ratio was 59.1 percent in February. This means that we have regained 2 of the 2½-point recessionary decline. We are currently 1 point below the all-time high in this measure achieved in 1979.

Over the last year the unemployment-population ratio for adult men has increased by nearly 2½ percentage points to 72.9 percent. This ratio is affected both by economic activity and by the long-term secular decline in labor force activity among men, particularly older men, which began many years ago. The employment-population ratio for adult women, on the other hand, declined only slightly during the recession and is now at a record 49.6 percent.

Payroll job gains were widespread. Construction posted an increase of almost 40,000 jobs in February and, since the industry's recession low, has added about 450,000 jobs. Manufacturing employment continued to advance, with February's gain of 110,000 occur-

ring primarily in durable goods. Employment in the service-producing sector continued its strong growth, adding 240,000 jobs February. The services industry accounted for almost 150,000 of the February increase and has added more than a million jobs during the recovery. Retail trade was another industry group to show a substantial over-the-month gain.

The performance in the manufacturing sector during the recovery has been quite uneven. Some industries, such as lumber, furniture, electrical equipment, and automobiles, have recovered all of their recessionary losses. Others, such as machinery, fabricated metals, and, most dramatically, primary metals, have shown relatively little employment recovery. At the extreme, steel has not regained any of its losses.

An interesting note is that the manufacuring workweek is at the highest level in nearly two decades. Increased hours are sometimes a substitute for employment growth. Thus, the statistic which combines workweek and employment gains, the index of aggregate weekly hours, has performed far better during the recovery than has manufacturing employment alone.

The overall and civilian unemployment rates have fallen two-tenths of a percentage point in each of the last 3 months. These recent jobless rate declines are positive signs of improvement in the labor market because of their consistent and steady downward trend.

The February developments are similar to other recent months in that adult men continued to pace the gains. Their jobless rate dropped from 7.3 to 7.0 percent, the lowest it has been since November 1981. Improvements were concentrated among workers looking for full-time jobs and among the very long-term unemployed. The number of jobless in more than a half year declined by 225,000 in February and by more than a million since last June. Both the mean and median duration of unemployment declined substantially over the month.

The labor force increased sharply in February. As you know, the labor force figures in the household survey often show considerable month-to-month variability. Until February, labor force growth during the recovery has been quite slow. When we include the February increase the labor force has grown by 1.7 million over the year, well below the 2.5 to 3.0 million annual gains in the late 1970's. As I have pointed out before, demographic changes, especially the decline in the youth population, explain much of this slowdown. Our experience suggests that it is unlikely that increases of the magnitude of the February labor force change will be sustained in later months. We can, I believe, anticipate a continued increase in the labor force participation of women, but we, of course, do not know exactly how large that increase will be. While we have seen an increase in retirement among older men during the recession, and, indeed, over the last several decades, the labor force participation rates for men in the 25- to 54-year-age group have remained quite high.

In summary, we continue to experience an unusually strong labor market recovery, reflected in large employment gains and a steady decline in the unemployment rate.

36-618 O 84 - 5

My colleagues and I would be happy to answer any questions the committee might have.

[The table attached to Ms. Norwood's statement, together with the Employment Situation press release referred to, follows:]

UNEMPLOYMENT RATES OF ALL CIVILIAN WORKERS BY ALTERNATIVE SEASONAL ADJUSTMENT METHODS

Month and year	Unadjusted rate	X-11 ARIMA method					X-11 method (official method before 1980)	Range (cols. 2-7)
		Official procedure	Concurrent	Stable	Total	Residual		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
1983								
February	11.3	10.4	10.4	10.2	10.5	10.6	10.4	0.4
March	10.8	10.3	10.3	10.2	10.4	10.4	10.3	.2
April	10.0	10.2	10.2	10.2	10.3	10.2	10.3	.1
May	9.8	10.1	10.1	10.2	10.1	10.1	10.1	.1
June	10.2	10.0	10.0	10.0	9.8	10.0	10.0	.2
July	9.4	9.5	9.5	9.4	9.5	9.5	9.5	.1
August	9.2	9.5	9.5	9.4	9.5	9.5	9.5	.1
September	8.8	9.2	9.2	9.2	9.2	9.1	9.3	.2
October	8.4	8.8	8.8	9.0	8.8	8.8	8.9	.2
November	8.1	8.4	8.4	8.5	8.4	8.4	8.4	.1
December	8.0	8.2	8.2	8.4	8.2	8.2	8.2	.2
1984								
January	8.8	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.1	8.0	8.0	.1
February	8.4	7.8	7.8	7.6	7.8	7.7	7.8	.2

EXPLANATION OF COLUMN HEADS

(1) Unadjusted rate. Unemployment rate for all civilian workers, not seasonally adjusted.

(2) Official procedure (X-11 ARIMA method). The published seasonally adjusted rate for all civilian workers. Each of the 3 major civilian labor force components—agricultural employment, nonagricultural employment and unemployment—for 4 age-sex groups—males and females, ages 16-19 and 20 years and over—are seasonally adjusted independently using data from January 1974 forward. The data series for each of these 12 components are extended by a year at each end of the original series using ARIMA (Auto-Regressive, Integrated, Moving Average) models chosen specifically for each series. Each extended series is then seasonally adjusted with the X-11 portion of the X-11 ARIMA program. The 4 teenage unemployment and nonagricultural employment components are adjusted with the additive adjustment model, while the other components are adjusted with the multiplicative model. The unemployment rate is computed by summing the 4 seasonally adjusted unemployment components and calculating that total as a percent of the civilian labor force total derived by summing all 12 seasonally adjusted components. All the seasonally adjusted series are revised a the end of each year. Extrapolated factors for January-June are computed at the beginning of each year; extrapolated factors for July-December are computed in the middle of the year after the June data become available. Each set of 6-month factors are published in advance, in the January and July issues, respectively, of Employment and Earnings.

(3) Concurrent (X-11 ARIMA method). The official procedure for computation of the rate for all civilian workers using the 12 components is followed except that extrapolated factors are not used at all. Each component is seasonally adjusted with the X-11 ARIMA program each month as the most recent data become available. Rates for each month of the current year are shown as first computed; they are revised only once each year, at the end of the year when data for the full year become available. For example, the rate for January 1984 would be based, during 1984, on the adjustment of data from the period January 1974 through January 1984.

(4) Stable (X-11 ARIMA method). Each of the 12 civilian labor force components is extended using ARIMA models as in the official procedure and then run through the X-11 part of the program using the stable option. This option assumes that seasonal patterns are basically constant from year-to-year and computes final seasonal factors as unweighted averages of all the seasonal-irregular components for each month across the entire span of the period adjusted. As in the official procedure, factors are extrapolated in 6-month intervals and the series are revised at the end of each year. The procedure for computation of the rate from the seasonally adjusted components is also identical to the official procedure.

(5) Total (X-11 ARIMA method). This is one alternative aggregation procedure, in which total unemployment and civilian labor force levels are extended with ARIMA models and directly adjusted with multiplicative adjustment models in the X-11 part of the program. The rate is computed by taking seasonally adjusted total unemployment as a percent of seasonally adjusted total civilian labor force. Factors are extrapolated in 6-month intervals and the series revised at the end of each year.

(6) Residual (X-11 ARIMA method). This is another alternative aggregation method, in which total civilian employment and civilian labor force levels are extended using ARIMA models and then directly adjusted with multiplicative adjustment models. The seasonally adjusted unemployment level is derived by subtracting seasonally adjusted employment from seasonally adjusted labor force. The rate is then computed by taking the derived unemployment level as a percent of the labor force level. Factors are extrapolated in 6-month intervals and the series revised at the end of each year.

(7) X-11 method (official method before 1980). The method for computation of the official procedure is used except that the series are not extended with ARIMA models and the factors are projected in 12-month intervals. The standard X-11 program is used to perform the seasonal adjustment.

Methods of Adjustment. The X-11 ARIMA method was developed at Statistics Canada by the Seasonal Adjustment and Times Series Staff under the direction of Estela Bee Dagum. The method is described in "The X-11 ARIMA Seasonal Adjustment Method," by Estela Bee Dagum, Statistics Canada Catalogue No. 12-564E, February 1980.

The standard X-11 method is described in "X-11 Variant of the Census Method II Seasonal Adjustment Program," by Julius Shiskin, Allan Young, and John Musgrave (Technical Paper No. 15, Bureau of the Census, 1967).

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, March 1984.

News

U.S. Department of Labor
Bureau of Labor Statistics
Washington, D.C. 20212

Technical information: (202) 523-1944
523-1371
523-1959
Media contact: 523-1913

USDL 84-102
TRANSMISSION OF MATERIAL IN THIS RELEASE IS EMBARGOED UNTIL 8:30 A.M. (EST), FRIDAY, MARCH 9, 1984

THE EMPLOYMENT SITUATION: FEBRUARY 1984

Employment rose markedly in February and unemployment continued to decline, the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U.S. Department of Labor reported today. Both the overall unemployment rate, at 7.7 percent, and the civilian worker rate, at 7.8 percent, dropped two-tenths of a percentage point over the month. Since the November 1982 recession trough, the rates have declined by 2.9 percentage points, and the number of unemployed has been reduced by 3.1 million.

Total civilian employment--as measured by the monthly survey of households--rose by 700,000 in February to 103.9 million, seasonally adjusted. The proportion of the civilian population with jobs was 59.1 percent, the highest since August 1981.

The number of employees on nonagricultural payrolls--as measured by the monthly survey of establishments--advanced by 385,000 to 92.2 million. Gains were particularly large in services and durable goods manufacturing.

Unemployment (Household Survey Data)

The unemployment rate for civilians dropped 0.2 percentage point in February to 7.8 percent, seasonally adjusted, as the number of unemployed declined by 225,000 to 8.8 million. The unemployment rate for adult men fell 0.3 point to 7.0 percent, while the rate for adult women edged down to 6.9 percent, and the rate for teenagers was stable at 19.3 percent. Jobless rates for black and white workers continued to trend down. The black teenage unemployment rate was down to 43.5 percent, reflecting improvements for young black women. The rate of Hispanic joblessness fell from 11.2 to 10.2 percent. (See tables A-2 and A-3.)

Both the mean and median duration of unemployment fell in February--to 18.8 and 8.3 weeks, respectively--as there was a substantial decline in the number of very long-term unemployed (27 or more weeks). Job losers accounted for about 54 percent of the jobless total, down from a recessionary high of 62 percent. (See tables A-7 and A-8.)

Total Employment and the Labor Force (Household Survey Data)

Total civilian employment, at 103.9 million, seasonally adjusted, increased by 700,000 in February and has risen by 4.9 million over the course of the recovery, the largest gain in the first 15 months of any post-World War II recovery period. Over-the-month increases were shared among adult men and women and white and black workers. Since November 1982, the proportion of the population with jobs has risen by about 2 percentage points for whites, to 60.2 percent, and by 3 percentage points for blacks, to 51.8 percent. (See tables A-2 and A-3.)

The rate of job growth over the past year has been greatest among precision production, craft, and repair workers--up 7 percent to 12.6 million--and operators, fabricators, and laborers--up 6 percent to 16.2 million. Service occupations recorded the lowest rate of growth during this period, while employment in farming, forestry, and fishing recorded a slight decline. (See table A-11.)

Centennial of Labor Statistics

The civilian labor force rose by 480,000 in February to 112.7 million, seasonally adjusted. Growth occurred among both white and black workers and was especially visible among adult women. Over the course of the recovery, labor force gains have kept pace with population growth, as the overall labor force participation rate of 64.1 percent in February was the same as in November 1982.

Industry Payroll Employment (Establishment Survey Data)

Nonagricultural payroll employment rose by 385,000 in February. Job gains continued to be widespread, with two-thirds of the 186 industries in the BLS index of diffusion registering over-the-month increases. At 92.2 million, seasonally adjusted, total nonfarm employment has risen by 650,000 over the past 2 months and was 3.5 million above the November 1982 level. (See tables B-1 and B-6.)

Two-thirds of the February increase occurred in the manufacturing (110,000) and services (145,000) industries, each of which continued their strong growth during the recovery period. Within manufacturing, over-the-month gains were concentrated in the durables goods industries, especially in electrical and electronic equipment, machinery, and transportation equipment, which together accounted for 60 percent of the overall manufacturing gain. In nondurable goods, the only notable increase was in the auto-related rubber and plastic products industry, which has shown strength in recent months. Total factory jobs have risen by 1.3 million since November 1982. The large over-the-month employment increase in the services industry continued the strong growth pattern during the past 15 months (1.1 million).

Table A. Major indicators of labor market activity, seasonally adjusted

Category	Quarterly averages			Monthly data			Jan.-Feb. change
	1982	1983		1983	1984		
	IV	III	IV	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	
HOUSEHOLD DATA							
	Thousands of persons						
Labor force 1/	112,493	113,737	113,702	113,824	113,901	114,377	476
Total employment 1/	100,718	103,209	104,195	104,629	104,876	105,576	700
Civilian labor force	110,829	112,057	112,012	112,136	112,215	112,693	478
Civilian employment	99,054	101,528	102,506	102,941	103,190	103,892	702
Unemployment	11,775	10,529	9,507	9,195	9,026	8,801	-225
Not in labor force	62,217	62,392	62,938	62,985	63,318	62,986	-332
Discouraged workers	1,813	1,610	1,457	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
	Percent of labor force						
Unemployment rates:							
All workers 1/	10.5	9.3	8.4	8.1	7.9	7.7	-0.2
All civilian workers	10.6	9.4	8.5	8.2	8.0	7.8	-0.2
Adult men	9.9	8.7	7.8	7.4	7.3	7.0	-0.3
Adult women	9.0	7.9	7.2	7.1	7.1	6.9	-0.2
Teenagers	24.1	22.4	20.6	20.1	19.4	19.3	-0.1
White	9.5	8.1	7.4	7.1	6.9	6.7	-0.2
Black	20.6	19.4	17.9	17.8	16.7	16.2	-0.5
Hispanic origin	15.3	12.8	12.1	11.6	11.2	10.7	-1.0
ESTABLISHMENT DATA							
	Thousands of jobs						
Nonfarm payroll employment	88,796	90,250	91,346	91,599	91,863p	92,249p	386p
Goods-producing industries	23,160	23,830	24,298	24,415	24,611p	24,760p	149p
Service-producing industries	65,636	66,421	67,048	67,184	67,252p	67,489p	237p
	Hours of work						
Average weekly hours:							
Total private nonfarm	34.7	35.1	35.3	35.3	35.5p	35.4p	-0.1p
Manufacturing	39.0	40.4	40.6	40.5	41.0p	41.0p	0p
Manufacturing overtime	2.3	3.1	3.3	3.4	3.5p	3.6p	0.1p

1/ Includes the resident Armed Forces. N.A.-not available.
p-preliminary.

Employment in retail trade declined somewhat less than usual from January to February, and, as a result, the job total rose by 55,000 after seasonal adjustment. Elsewhere, the number of jobs in construction rose by 35,000, and there was also an increase in the durable goods portion of wholesale trade.

Weekly Hours (Establishment Survey Data)

The average workweek of production or nonsupervisory workers on private nonagricultural payrolls edged down 0.1 hour in February to 35.4 hours, seasonally adjusted. At 41.0 hours, the manufacturing workweek held steady at the highest level since January 1967. Factory overtime hours were about unchanged over the month at 3.6 hours, the highest level since early 1979. (See table B-2.)

The index of aggregate weekly hours of production or nonsupervisory workers on private nonagricultural payrolls, at 110.2 (1977=100) in February, was little changed over the month. The manufacturing index was up 0.7 percent in February to 96.5, 16.1 percent above the recession low. (See table B-5.)

Hourly and Weekly Earnings (Establishment Survey Data)

Average hourly earnings were about unchanged in February, while average weekly earnings decreased 0.2 percent, seasonally adjusted. Prior to adjustment for seasonality, average hourly earnings also were about unchanged in February at $8.24, and average weekly earnings rose by 47 cents to $289.22. Since February 1983, average hourly earnings have risen by 32 cents, and average weekly earnings were up by $18.36. (See table B-3.)

The Hourly Earnings Index (Establishment Survey Data)

The Hourly Earnings Index (HEI) was 158.2 (1977=100) in February, seasonally adjusted, essentially unchanged from January. For the 12 months ended in February, the increase (before seasonal adjustment) was 3.2 percent. The HEI excludes the effects of two types of changes unrelated to underlying wage rate movements--fluctuations in overtime in manufacturing and interindustry employment shifts. In dollars of constant purchasing power, the HEI decreased 0.1 percent during the 12-month period ended in January. (See table B-4.)

Explanatory Note

This news release presents statistics from two major surveys, the Current Population Survey (household survey) and the Current Employment Statistics Survey (establishment survey). The household survey provides the information on the labor force, total employment, and unemployment that appears in the A tables, marked HOUSEHOLD DATA. It is a sample survey of about 60,000 households that is conducted by the Bureau of the Census with most of the findings analyzed and published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS).

The establishment survey provides the information on the employment, hours, and earnings of workers on nonagricultural payrolls that appears in the B tables, marked ESTABLISHMENT DATA. This information is collected from payroll records by BLS in cooperation with State agencies. The sample includes approximately 189,000 establishments employing about 36 million people.

For both surveys, the data for a given month are actually collected for and relate to a particular week. In the household survey, unless otherwise indicated, it is the calendar week that contains the 12th day of the month, which is called the survey week. In the establishment survey, the reference week is the pay period including the 12th, which may or may not correspond directly to the calendar week.

The data in this release are affected by a number of technical factors, including definitions, survey differences, seasonal adjustments, and the inevitable variance in results between a survey of a sample and a census of the entire population. Each of these factors is explained below.

Coverage, definitions and differences between surveys

The sample households in the household survey are selected so as to reflect the entire civilian noninstitutional population 16 years of age and older. Each person in a household is classified as employed, unemployed, or not in the labor force. Those who hold more than one job are classified according to the job at which they worked the most hours.

People are classified as *employed* if they did any work at all as paid civilians; worked in their own business or profession or on their own farm; or worked 15 hours or more in an enterprise operated by a member of their family, whether they were paid or not. People are also counted as employed if they were on unpaid leave because of illness, bad weather, disputes between labor and management, or personal reasons. Members of the Armed Forces stationed in the United States are also included in the employed total.

People are classified as *unemployed*, regardless of their eligibility for unemployment benefits or public assistance, if they meet all of the following criteria: They had no employment during the survey week; they were available for work at that time; and they made specific efforts to find employment sometime during the prior 4 weeks. Also included among the unemployed are persons not looking for work because they were laid off and waiting to be recalled and those expecting to report to a job within 30 days.

The *labor force* equals the sum of the number employed and the number unemployed. The *unemployment rate* is the percentage of unemployed people in the labor force (civilian plus the resident Armed Forces). Table A-5 presents a special grouping of seven measures of unemployment based on varying definitions of unemployment and the labor force. The definitions are provided in the table. The most restrictive definition yields U-1, and the most comprehensive yields U-7. The overall unemployment rate is U-5a, while U-5b represents the same measure with a civilian labor force base.

Unlike the household survey, the establishment survey only counts wage and salary employees whose names appear on the payroll records of nonagricultural firms. As a result, there are many differences between the two surveys, among which are the following:

-----The household survey, although based on a smaller sample, reflects a larger segment of the population; the establishment survey excludes agriculture, the self-employed, unpaid family workers, private household workers, and members of the resident Armed Forces;

-----The household survey includes people on unpaid leave among the employed; the establishment survey does not;

-----The household survey is limited to those 16 years of age and older; the establishment survey is not limited by age;

-----The household survey has no duplication of individuals, because each individual is counted only once; in the establishment survey, employees working at more than one job or otherwise appearing on more than one payroll would be counted separately for each appearance.

Other differences between the two surveys are described in "Comparing Employment Estimates from Household and Payroll Surveys," which may be obtained from the BLS upon request.

Seasonal adjustment

Over a course of a year, the size of the Nation's labor force and the levels of employment and unemployment undergo sharp fluctuations due to such seasonal events as changes in weather, reduced or expanded production, harvests, major holidays, and the opening and closing of schools. For example, the labor force increases by a large number each June, when schools close and many young people enter the job market. The effect of such seasonal variation can be very large; over the course of a year, for example, seasonality may account for as much as 95 percent of the month-to-month changes in unemployment.

Because these seasonal events follow a more or less regular pattern each year, their influence on statistical trends can be eliminated by adjusting the statistics from month to month. These adjustments make nonseasonal developments, such as declines in economic activity or increases in the participation of women in the labor force, easier to spot. To return to the school's-out example, the large number of people entering the labor force each June is likely to obscure any other changes that have taken place since May, making it difficult to determine if the level of economic activity has risen or declined. However, because the effect of students finishing school in previous years is known, the statistics for the current year can be adjusted to allow for a comparable change. Insofar as the seasonal adjustment is made correctly, the adjusted figure provides a more useful tool with which to analyze changes in economic activity.

Measures of labor force, employment, and unemployment contain components such as age and sex. Statistics for all

employees, production workers, average weekly hours, and average hourly earnings include components based on the employer's industry. All these statistics can be seasonally adjusted either by adjusting the total or by adjusting each of the components and combining them. The second procedure usually yields more accurate information and is therefore followed by BLS. For example, the seasonally adjusted figure for the labor force is the sum of eight seasonally adjusted civilian employment components, plus the resident Armed Forces total (not adjusted for seasonality), and four seasonally adjusted unemployment components; the total for unemployment is the sum of the four unemployment components; and the overall unemployment rate is derived by dividing the resulting estimate of total unemployment by the estimate of the labor force.

The numerical factors used to make the seasonal adjustments are recalculated regularly. For the household survey, the factors are calculated for the January-June period and again for the July-December period. The January revision is applied to data that have been published over the previous 5 years. For the establishment survey, updated factors for seasonal adjustment are calculated only once a year, along with the introduction of new benchmarks which are discussed at the end of the next section.

Sampling variability

Statistics based on the household and establishment surveys are subject to sampling error, that is, the estimate of the number of people employed and the other estimates drawn from these surveys probably differ from the figures that would be obtained from a complete census, even if the same questionnaires and procedures were used. In the household survey, the amount of the differences can be expressed in terms of standard errors. The numerical value of a standard error depends upon the size of the sample, the results of the survey, and other factors. However, the numerical value is always such that the chances are 68 out of 100 that an estimate based on the sample will differ by no more than the standard error from the results of a complete census. The chances are 90 out of 100 that an estimate based on the sample will differ by no more than 1.6 times the standard error from the results of a complete census. At the 90-percent level of confidence--the confidence limits used by BLS in its analyses--the error for the monthly change in total employment is on the order of plus or minus 335,000; for total unemployment it is 240,000; and, for the overall unemployment rate, it is 0.21 percentage point. These figures do not mean that the sample results are off by these magnitudes but, rather, that the chances are 90 out of 100 that the "true" level or rate would not be expected to differ from the estimates by more than these amounts.

Sampling errors for monthly surveys are reduced when the data are cumulated for several months, such as quarterly or annually. Also, as a general rule, the smaller the estimate, the larger the sampling error. Therefore, relatively speaking, the estimate of the size of the labor force is subject to less error than is the estimate of the number unemployed. And, among the unemployed, the sampling error for the jobless rate of adult men, for example, is much smaller than is the error for the jobless rate of teenagers. Specifically, the error on monthly change in the jobless rate for men is .29 percentage point; for teenagers, it is 1.28 percentage points.

In the establishment survey, estimates for the 2 most current months are based on incomplete returns; for this reason, these estimates are labeled preliminary in the tables. When all the returns in the sample have been received, the estimates are revised. In other words, data for the month of September are published in preliminary form in October and November and in final form in December. To remove errors that build up over time, a comprehensive count of the employed is conducted each year. The results of this survey are used to establish new benchmarks—comprehensive counts of employment—against which month-to-month changes can be measured. The new benchmarks also incorporate changes in the classification of industries and allow for the formation of new establishments.

Additional statistics and other information

In order to provide a broad view of the Nation's employment situation, BLS regularly publishes a wide variety of data in this news release. More comprehensive statistics are contained in *Employment and Earnings*, published each month by BLS. It is available for $6.00 per issue or $39.00 per year from the U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20204. A check or money order made out to the Superintendent of Documents must accompany all orders.

Employment and Earnings also provides approximations of the standard errors for the household survey data published in this release. For unemployment and other labor force categories, the standard errors appear in tables B through J of its "Explanatory Notes." Measures of the reliability of the data drawn from the establishment survey and the actual amounts of revision due to benchmark adjustments are provided in tables M, O, P, and Q of that publication.

Table A-1. Employment status of the population, including Armed Forces in the United States, by sex

(Numbers in thousands)

Employment status and sex	Not seasonally adjusted			Seasonally adjusted[1]					
	Feb. 1983	Jan. 1984	Feb. 1984	Feb. 1983	Oct. 1983	Nov. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984	Feb. 1984
TOTAL									
Noninstitutional population[2]	175,169	177,219	177,363	175,169	176,474	176,636	176,805	177,219	177,363
Labor force[3]	111,311	112,711	113,052	112,352	113,561	113,720	113,824	113,931	114,377
Participation rate[4]	63.5	63.6	63.7	64.1	64.3	64.4	64.4	64.3	64.5
Total employed[5]	98,929	102,356	103,645	100,836	103,665	104,291	104,629	104,876	105,576
Employment-population ratio[6]	56.5	58.1	58.4	57.6	58.7	59.0	59.2	59.2	59.5
Resident Armed Forces	1,684	1,686	1,684	1,684	1,695	1,685	1,688	1,686	1,684
Civilian employed	97,245	100,670	101,961	99,152	101,970	102,606	102,941	103,190	103,892
Agriculture	2,865	2,807	2,857	3,415	3,240	3,257	3,358	3,271	3,395
Nonagricultural industries	94,380	98,463	99,104	95,737	98,730	99,349	99,585	99,918	100,496
Unemployed	12,382	9,755	9,407	11,516	9,896	9,429	9,195	9,056	8,801
Unemployment rate[7]	11.1	8.7	8.3	10.2	8.7	8.3	8.1	7.9	7.7
Not in labor force	63,858	64,508	64,311	62,817	62,913	62,916	62,985	63,318	62,986
Men, 16 years and over									
Noninstitutional population[2]	83,720	84,745	84,811	83,720	84,349	84,423	84,506	84,745	84,811
Labor force[3]	63,471	64,169	64,203	64,077	64,709	64,846	64,835	64,930	65,093
Participation rate[4]	75.8	75.7	75.7	76.5	76.7	76.8	76.7	76.6	76.8
Total employed[5]	55,039	58,372	58,629	57,321	58,350	59,389	59,580	59,701	60,147
Employment-population ratio[6]	66.7	68.9	69.1	68.5	69.2	70.3	70.5	70.5	70.9
Resident Armed Forces	1,528	1,502	1,540	1,528	1,543	1,534	1,537	1,542	1,540
Civilian employed	54,311	56,830	57,089	55,793	57,407	57,855	58,043	58,239	58,607
Unemployed	7,632	5,797	5,574	6,756	5,759	5,457	5,255	5,229	4,946
Unemployment rate[7]	12.0	9.0	8.7	10.5	8.9	8.4	8.1	7.9	7.6
Women, 16 years and over									
Noninstitutional population[2]	91,449	92,474	92,552	91,449	92,129	92,214	92,302	92,474	92,552
Labor force[3]	47,840	48,542	48,849	48,275	48,852	48,874	48,986	48,971	49,283
Participation rate[4]	52.3	52.5	52.8	52.8	53.0	53.0	53.1	53.0	53.2
Total employed[5]	43,889	44,584	45,016	43,515	44,715	44,902	45,049	45,094	45,429
Employment-population ratio[6]	47.1	48.2	48.6	47.6	48.5	48.7	48.8	48.8	49.1
Resident Armed Forces	136	144	144	136	152	151	151	144	144
Civilian employed	43,753	44,440	44,872	43,379	44,563	44,751	44,898	44,950	45,285
Unemployed	3,951	3,958	3,833	4,760	4,137	3,972	3,937	3,876	3,855
Unemployment rate[7]	8.3	8.2	7.8	9.9	8.5	8.1	8.0	7.9	7.8

[1] The population and Armed Forces figures are not adjusted for seasonal variation; therefore, identical numbers appear in the unadjusted and seasonally adjusted columns.

[2] Includes members of the Armed Forces stationed in the United States.

[3] Labor force as a percent of the noninstitutional population.

[4] Total employment as a percent of the noninstitutional population.

[5] Unemployment as a percent of the labor force (including the resident Armed Forces).

HOUSEHOLD DATA

Table A-2. Employment status of the civilian population by sex and age

(Numbers in thousands)

Employment status, sex, and age	Not seasonally adjusted			Seasonally adjusted[1]					
	Feb. 1989	Jan. 1990	Feb. 1990	Feb. 1989	Oct. 1989	Nov. 1989	Dec. 1989	Jan. 1990	Feb. 1990
TOTAL									
Civilian noninstitutional population	173,505	175,333	175,479	173,505	174,779	174,951	175,121	175,333	175,479
Civilian labor force	110,688	111,025	111,368	110,688	111,866	112,035	112,136	112,215	112,893
Participation rate	63.8	63.3	63.4	63.8	64.0	64.0	64.0	63.9	64.1
Employed	99,172	101,270	101,961	99,172	101,370	102,606	102,941	103,190	103,892
Employment-population ratio[2]	57.2	57.7	58.0	57.2	58.3	58.6	58.8	58.8	59.1
Unemployed	11,516	9,755	9,407	11,516	9,896	9,429	9,195	9,026	9,001
Unemployment rate	10.4	8.8	8.4	10.4	8.8	8.4	8.2	8.0	7.8
Men, 20 years and over									
Civilian noninstitutional population	74,438	75,692	75,786	74,438	75,216	75,327	75,433	75,692	75,786
Civilian labor force	58,083	58,920	58,964	58,225	58,949	59,053	59,050	59,299	59,394
Participation rate	78.0	77.8	77.8	78.2	78.4	78.4	78.3	78.3	78.4
Employed	51,906	53,983	54,220	52,508	54,140	54,857	54,658	54,939	55,266
Employment-population ratio[2]	69.2	71.3	71.5	70.5	72.0	72.3	72.5	72.7	72.9
Agriculture	2,153	2,130	2,156	2,402	2,376	2,336	2,378	2,356	2,409
Nonagricultural industries	49,353	51,853	52,064	50,106	51,764	52,521	52,284	52,613	52,857
Unemployed	6,177	4,941	4,743	5,717	4,809	4,196	4,392	4,300	4,128
Unemployment rate	11.3	8.4	8.0	9.8	8.2	7.8	7.4	7.3	7.0
Women, 20 years and over									
Civilian noninstitutional population	83,593	84,860	84,962	83,593	84,483	84,553	84,666	84,860	84,962
Civilian labor force	44,219	44,883	45,223	44,248	44,936	44,953	45,024	44,981	45,258
Participation rate	52.9	52.9	53.2	52.9	53.2	53.2	53.2	53.0	53.3
Employed	40,219	41,548	42,048	40,315	41,570	41,738	41,843	41,798	42,138
Employment-population ratio[2]	48.1	49.0	49.5	48.2	49.2	49.4	49.4	49.3	49.6
Agriculture	506	498	509	640	597	638	653	625	640
Nonagricultural industries	39,713	41,050	41,539	39,675	40,973	41,100	41,190	41,174	41,498
Unemployed	4,000	3,335	3,176	3,933	3,366	3,215	3,181	3,182	3,120
Unemployment rate	9.0	7.4	7.0	8.9	7.5	7.2	7.1	7.1	6.9
Both sexes, 16 to 19 years									
Civilian noninstitutional population	15,478	14,981	14,931	15,478	15,120	15,072	15,022	14,981	14,931
Civilian labor force	7,385	7,218	7,181	8,215	7,981	8,029	8,062	7,935	8,081
Participation rate	47.5	48.2	48.1	53.1	52.8	53.3	53.7	53.0	53.9
Employed	5,539	5,739	5,693	6,349	6,260	6,411	6,440	6,392	6,488
Employment-population ratio[2]	35.8	38.3	38.1	41.0	41.4	42.5	42.9	42.7	43.5
Agriculture	207	179	192	373	267	283	329	290	346
Nonagricultural industries	5,333	5,560	5,501	5,976	5,993	6,128	6,111	6,102	6,142
Unemployed	1,845	1,479	1,488	1,866	1,721	1,618	1,622	1,543	1,553
Unemployment rate	24.6	20.5	20.7	22.7	21.6	20.2	20.1	19.4	19.3

[1] The population figures are not adjusted for seasonal variation; therefore, identical numbers appear in the unadjusted and seasonally adjusted columns.

[2] Civilian employment as a percent of the civilian noninstitutional population.

HOUSEHOLD DATA

Table A-3. Employment status of the civilian population by race, sex, age, and Hispanic origin

(Numbers in thousands)

Employment status, race, sex, age, and Hispanic origin	Not seasonally adjusted			Seasonally adjusted[1]					
	Feb. 1983	Jan. 1984	Feb. 1984	Feb. 1984	Oct. 1983	Sep. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984	Feb. 1984
WHITE									
Civilian noninstitutional population	150,187	151,339	150,879	150,187	151,175	151,129	151,000	151,119	150,879
Civilian labor force	95,368	96,767	96,971	96,218	97,339	97,559	97,720	97,813	96,967
Participation rate	63.5	63.7	63.8	64.1	64.4	64.5	64.5	64.3	64.2
Employed	86,619	89,768	89,778	87,367	89,453	89,418	90,178	91,044	91,588
Employment-population ratio[2]	57.6	59.3	59.5	58.2	59.2	59.2	59.7	60.3	60.7
Unemployed	8,749	6,999	7,248	8,971	7,886	8,140	7,542	6,768	6,823
Unemployment rate	10.2	7.7	7.5	9.2	7.7	7.7	7.3	6.9	6.7
Men, 20 years and over									
Civilian labor force	51,138	51,939	51,916	51,271	51,902	52,021	52,061	52,270	52,135
Participation rate	76.5	76.1	76.2	76.7	76.9	76.9	76.9	76.8	76.6
Employed	47,082	48,018	48,166	46,777	48,029	48,014	48,349	48,764	48,987
Employment-population ratio[2]	70.4	72.4	72.5	71.8	71.3	71.5	71.6	71.8	72.0
Unemployed	4,056	3,904	3,750	4,494	3,776	3,607	3,676	3,506	3,148
Unemployment rate	10.4	7.5	7.2	8.8	7.3	6.9	7.1	6.7	6.1
Women, 20 years and over									
Civilian labor force	37,687	38,818	38,678	37,696	38,818	38,804	38,744	38,745	38,720
Participation rate	52.2	52.9	52.7	52.2	52.7	52.7	52.6	52.6	52.6
Employed	36,695	37,963	36,796	36,785	36,916	36,777	36,792	36,818	36,965
Employment-population ratio[2]	50.9	51.7	51.4	50.9	50.6	50.4	50.4	50.6	50.7
Unemployed	2,991	2,855	2,822	2,911	2,902	2,912	2,964	2,926	2,755
Unemployment rate	7.9	6.9	6.8	7.7	7.1	6.8	6.9	6.8	6.4
Both sexes, 16 to 19 years									
Civilian labor force	6,580	6,810	6,378	7,251	6,999	7,089	7,181	7,019	7,136
Participation rate	53.0	53.9	51.8	58.7	56.2	56.7	57.2	56.9	57.7
Employed	5,082	5,271	5,202	5,810	5,707	5,819	5,890	5,930	5,938
Employment-population ratio[2]	39.6	42.6	42.2	47.1	45.8	46.5	46.9	48.1	48.1
Unemployed	1,662	1,539	1,176	1,441	1,292	1,270	1,291	1,090	1,198
Unemployment rate	22.1	17.8	14.9	20.1	18.5	17.9	18.0	15.7	16.8
Men	24.8	20.7	19.6	23.8	19.8	17.6	17.5	17.8	16.9
Women	19.4	14.5	17.2	16.7	15.9	16.6	16.5	13.5	16.7
BLACK									
Civilian noninstitutional population	18,796	19,196	19,222	18,796	19,226	19,047	19,088	19,196	19,222
Civilian labor force	11,166	11,478	11,655	11,563	11,565	11,671	11,660	11,660	11,801
Participation rate	60.5	59.8	60.6	61.5	60.8	61.0	61.0	60.7	61.4
Employed	9,076	9,513	9,752	9,272	9,489	9,583	9,582	9,707	9,958
Employment-population ratio[2]	48.1	49.6	50.7	49.3	49.7	50.3	50.2	50.6	51.8
Unemployed	2,090	1,965	1,903	2,289	2,076	2,088	2,078	1,953	1,843
Unemployment rate	20.1	17.1	16.3	19.8	18.1	17.7	17.8	16.7	15.6
Men, 20 years and over									
Civilian labor force	5,420	5,569	5,630	5,492	5,591	5,668	5,615	5,671	5,677
Participation rate	70.9	70.1	70.8	70.7	70.2	70.7	70.7	70.8	70.8
Employed	4,317	4,665	4,778	4,417	4,607	4,701	4,722	4,789	4,877
Employment-population ratio[2]	59.7	62.1	63.4	60.6	62.1	63.2	63.4	64.1	64.8
Unemployed	1,103	900	860	1,075	984	967	893	881	800
Unemployment rate	20.4	16.2	15.3	19.6	16.1	15.6	15.9	15.5	14.1
Women, 20 years and over									
Civilian labor force	5,290	5,261	5,156	5,119	5,237	5,278	5,301	5,287	5,408
Participation rate	57.1	56.3	55.3	57.7	56.1	56.9	56.3	56.6	56.9
Employed	4,818	4,959	4,598	4,838	4,938	4,988	4,963	4,922	4,938
Employment-population ratio[2]	47.6	47.4	48.9	47.9	47.2	47.2	47.1	47.2	47.3
Unemployed	480	303	358	281	299	290	338	365	471
Unemployment rate	10.6	10.5	10.2	10.9	10.9	10.6	10.9	10.3	10.8
Both sexes, 16 to 19 years									
Civilian labor force	636	649	669	700	687	705	702	702	730
Participation rate	29.4	29.6	30.6	34.7	33.6	34.6	34.4	34.1	36.0
Employed	389	345	384	417	409	414	399	397	450
Employment-population ratio[2]	17.5	15.7	17.6	20.5	19.3	20.3	19.5	19.3	22.2
Unemployed	186	304	285	283	281	291	303	305	280
Unemployment rate	46.7	46.9	42.6	40.5	40.7	41.3	43.2	43.4	38.4
Men	49.7	46.5	40.4	47.2	45.6	44.9	46.4	47.1	40.2
Women	43.3	47.3	46.1	45.7	52.2	50.0	51.9	48.8	39.9
HISPANIC ORIGIN									
Civilian noninstitutional population	9,368	9,778	9,906	9,368	9,785	9,677	9,735	9,778	9,906
Civilian labor force	6,185	6,195	6,317	6,001	6,165	6,232	6,267	6,316	6,292
Participation rate	66.0	63.4	63.8	64.1	63.1	64.4	64.4	64.6	63.5
Employed	5,436	5,436	5,477	5,071	5,198	5,342	5,540	5,427	5,652
Employment-population ratio[2]	58.0	55.6	55.3	54.1	53.1	55.2	56.9	55.5	57.1
Unemployed	749	758	840	930	967	889	727	889	639
Unemployment rate	12.1	12.2	13.3	15.5	15.7	14.3	11.6	14.1	10.2

[1] The population figures are not adjusted for seasonal variation; therefore, identical numbers appear in the unadjusted and seasonally adjusted columns.

[2] Civilian employment as a percent of the civilian noninstitutional population.

NOTE: Detail for the above race and Hispanic-origin groups will not sum to totals because data for the "other races" group are not presented and Hispanics are included in both the white and black population groups.

HOUSEHOLD DATA

HOUSEHOLD DATA

Table A-4. Selected employment indicators

(Numbers in thousands)

Category	Not seasonally adjusted			Seasonally adjusted					
	Feb. 1983	Jan. 1984	Feb. 1984	Feb. 1983	Oct. 1983	Nov. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984	Feb. 1984
CHARACTERISTIC									
Civilian employed, 16 years and over	97,265	101,270	101,961	99,172	101,970	102,606	102,981	103,190	103,892
Married men, spouse present	36,867	38,102	38,250	37,491	38,240	38,386	38,696	38,682	38,911
Married women, spouse present	24,094	24,897	25,162	24,129	24,953	25,057	25,140	24,987	25,212
Women who maintain families	5,055	5,293	5,389	5,016	5,172	5,236	5,258	5,293	5,346
MAJOR INDUSTRY AND CLASS OF WORKER									
Agriculture:									
Wage and salary workers	1,317	1,169	1,278	1,617	1,535	1,481	1,512	1,483	1,560
Self-employed workers	1,190	1,471	1,427	1,562	1,527	1,556	1,572	1,633	1,609
Unpaid family workers	158	187	160	230	227	224	265	233	232
Nonagricultural industries:									
Wage and salary workers	86,780	90,436	91,080	87,916	90,617	91,094	91,422	91,641	92,379
Government	15,749	15,675	16,075	15,510	15,578	15,585	15,481	15,535	15,822
Private industries	71,031	74,761	75,005	72,406	75,039	75,509	75,941	76,106	76,557
Private households	1,158	1,099	1,158	1,222	1,278	1,216	1,241	1,197	1,219
Other industries	69,873	73,662	73,851	71,184	73,761	74,293	74,700	74,909	75,339
Self-employed workers	7,304	7,714	7,731	7,403	7,695	7,800	7,734	7,936	7,869
Unpaid family workers	315	333	293	354	435	474	450	364	330
PERSONS AT WORK[1]									
Nonagricultural industries	90,486	94,663	95,249	92,276	93,273	93,838	94,173	94,707	95,067
Full-time schedules	71,278	76,008	76,255	71,703	75,047	75,398	75,804	76,237	76,715
Part time for economic reasons	6,195	5,815	5,634	6,362	5,724	5,848	5,712	5,943	5,808
Usually work full time	2,175	1,986	1,704	2,059	1,617	1,719	1,677	1,771	1,611
Usually work part time	4,020	3,909	3,926	4,303	4,107	4,129	4,040	4,172	4,197
Part time for noneconomic reasons	13,013	12,840	13,360	12,211	12,502	12,588	12,659	12,527	12,545

[1] Excludes persons "with a job but not at work" during the survey period for such reasons as vacation, illness, or industrial dispute.

Table A-5. Range of unemployment measures based on varying definitions of unemployment and the labor force, seasonally adjusted

(Percent)

Measure	Quarterly averages					Monthly data		
	1982	1983				1983	1984	
	IV	I	II	III	IV	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.
U-1 Persons unemployed 15 weeks or longer as a percent of the civilian labor force	4.3	4.2	4.0	3.7	3.1	3.0	2.9	2.6
U-2 Job losers as a percent of the civilian labor force	6.6	6.2	6.0	5.4	4.7	4.5	4.3	4.2
U-3 Unemployed persons 25 years and over as a percent of the civilian labor force	8.3	8.1	7.9	7.3	6.6	6.4	6.2	6.1
U-4 Unemployed full-time jobseekers as a percent of the full-time civilian labor force	10.6	10.3	10.0	9.3	8.3	8.0	7.8	7.5
U-5a Total unemployed as a percent of the labor force, including the resident Armed Forces	10.5	10.2	10.0	9.3	9.4	8.1	7.9	7.7
U-5b Total unemployed as a percent of the civilian labor force	10.6	10.4	10.1	9.4	8.5	8.2	8.0	7.8
U-6 Total full-time jobseekers plus ½ part-time jobseekers plus ½ total on part time for economic reasons as a percent of the civilian labor force less ½ of the part time labor force	13.7	13.4	12.9	12.2	11.2	10.8	10.8	10.4
U-7 Total full-time jobseekers plus ½ part-time jobseekers plus ½ total on part time for economic reasons plus discouraged workers as a percent of the civilian labor force plus discouraged workers less ½ of the part-time labor force	15.2	14.9	14.4	13.5	12.4	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.

N.A. = not available.

HOUSEHOLD DATA

Table A-6. Selected unemployment indicators, seasonally adjusted

Category	Number of unemployed persons (in thousands)			Unemployment rates[1]					
	Feb. 1983	Jan. 1984	Feb. 1984	Feb. 1983	Oct. 1983	Nov. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984	Feb. 1984
CHARACTERISTIC									
Total, 16 years and over	11,516	9,026	9,001	10.4	8.3	8.4	8.2	8.0	7.8
Men, 16 years and over	6,756	5,149	4,946	10.8	9.1	8.6	8.1	8.1	7.6
Men, 20 years and over	5,717	4,300	4,128	9.8	8.2	7.8	7.4	7.3	7.0
Women, 16 years and over	4,760	3,876	3,955	9.9	8.5	8.2	8.1	7.9	7.8
Women, 20 years and over	3,933	3,102	3,120	8.9	7.5	7.2	7.1	7.1	6.9
Both sexes, 16 to 19 years	1,866	1,501	1,453	22.7	21.6	20.2	20.1	19.4	19.3
Married men, spouse present	2,920	2,025	1,993	7.2	5.7	5.5	5.2	5.0	4.8
Married women, spouse present	1,998	1,579	1,579	7.6	6.3	6.0	6.1	6.0	5.9
Women who maintain families	760	636	658	13.2	11.4	10.5	10.9	10.7	11.0
Full-time workers	9,054	7,532	7,283	10.4	8.7	8.2	8.0	7.9	7.5
Part-time workers	1,780	1,446	1,459	10.1	10.0	9.8	9.8	9.2	9.1
Labor force time lost[2]	--	--	--	11.9	10.3	9.7	9.6	9.2	8.9
INDUSTRY									
Nonagricultural private wage and salary workers	8,762	6,568	6,478	10.8	9.3	8.6	8.3	7.9	7.8
Mining	237	197	127	19.1	12.1	12.8	12.4	10.9	12.2
Construction	1,079	948	881	19.9	15.6	15.6	16.1	17.0	17.1
Manufacturing	2,814	1,869	1,845	13.1	9.6	8.9	8.3	8.9	7.7
Durable goods	1,667	1,062	949	14.5	10.2	9.0	8.3	8.0	7.3
Nondurable goods	997	807	696	11.0	8.7	8.7	8.2	8.9	7.9
Transportation and public utilities	458	290	346	8.0	7.2	6.7	6.5	5.1	5.9
Wholesale and retail trade	2,265	1,774	1,776	10.9	9.3	9.1	8.8	8.9	8.3
Finance and service industries	1,909	1,691	1,703	7.9	6.9	6.7	6.6	6.1	6.1
Government workers	987	812	787	5.8	5.1	4.9	5.0	5.0	4.7
Agricultural wage and salary workers	314	265	253	16.3	16.2	15.7	15.6	15.5	14.0

[1] Unemployed as a percent of the civilian labor force.

[2] Aggregate hours lost by the unemployed and persons on part time for economic reasons as a percent of potentially available labor force hours.

Table A-7. Duration of unemployment

(Numbers in thousands)

Weeks of unemployment	Not seasonally adjusted			Seasonally adjusted					
	Feb. 1983	Jan. 1984	Feb. 1984	Feb. 1983	Oct. 1983	Nov. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984	Feb. 1984
DURATION									
Less than 5 weeks	3,507	3,618	3,357	3,732	3,504	3,328	3,382	3,233	3,359
5 to 14 weeks	3,823	2,669	2,986	3,169	2,725	2,616	2,504	2,556	2,494
15 weeks and over	5,052	3,948	3,268	4,613	3,655	3,527	3,369	3,201	2,984
15 to 26 weeks	2,221	1,160	1,358	1,928	1,172	1,337	1,288	1,196	1,173
27 weeks and over	2,832	2,788	1,910	2,685	2,483	2,190	2,080	2,005	1,810
Average (mean) duration, in weeks	19.4	19.8	19.2	19.1	20.1	20.2	19.6	20.5	18.8
Median duration, in weeks	11.0	8.8	9.3	9.8	9.5	9.4	9.0	9.2	8.3
PERCENT DISTRIBUTION									
Total unemployed	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Less than 5 weeks	30.3	37.1	33.6	32.4	35.5	35.1	36.5	36.0	36.1
5 to 14 weeks	30.9	27.6	31.7	27.5	27.6	27.6	27.1	28.4	28.1
15 weeks and over	40.8	35.3	34.7	40.1	37.0	37.2	36.4	35.6	33.8
15 to 26 weeks	17.9	17.5	14.4	16.7	11.9	14.1	13.9	13.3	13.3
27 weeks and over	22.9	21.8	[illegible]	23.3	25.1	23.1	22.5	22.3	20.5

HOUSEHOLD DATA

Table A-8. Reason for unemployment

[Numbers in thousands]

Reason	Not seasonally adjusted			Seasonally adjusted					
	Feb. 1983	Jan. 1984	Feb. 1984	Feb. 1983	Oct. 1983	Nov. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984	Feb. 1984
NUMBER OF UNEMPLOYED									
Job losers	7,935	5,636	5,471	6,564	5,601	5,226	5,017	4,825	4,737
On layoff	2,654	1,692	1,613	2,084	1,392	1,321	1,283	1,233	1,272
Other job losers	5,285	3,944	3,858	4,780	4,209	3,905	3,734	3,588	3,465
Job leavers	842	861	787	830	866	868	855	809	772
Reentrants	2,521	2,256	2,168	2,505	2,322	2,250	2,246	2,192	2,153
New entrants	1,079	1,020	981	1,188	1,127	1,154	1,150	1,175	1,092
PERCENT DISTRIBUTION									
Total unemployed	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Job losers	64.1	57.7	58.1	60.3	56.5	55.0	58.1	53.6	58.1
On layoff	21.4	17.3	17.1	18.3	14.0	13.9	13.8	13.7	14.5
Other job losers	42.7	40.4	41.0	42.0	42.4	41.1	40.3	39.9	39.6
Job leavers	6.8	8.8	8.4	7.3	8.7	9.1	9.2	9.0	8.8
Reentrants	20.4	23.1	23.0	22.0	23.4	23.7	24.2	24.4	24.6
New entrants	8.7	10.5	10.4	10.4	11.4	12.1	12.4	13.1	12.5
UNEMPLOYED AS A PERCENT OF THE CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE									
Job losers	7.2	5.1	4.9	6.2	5.0	4.7	4.5	4.3	4.2
Job leavers	.8	.8	.7	.7	.8	.8	.8	.7	.7
Reentrants	2.3	2.0	1.9	2.3	2.1	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.9
New entrants	1.0	.9	.9	1.1	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0

Table A-9. Unemployed persons by sex and age, seasonally adjusted

Sex and age	Number of unemployed persons (in thousands)			Unemployment rates[1]					
	Feb. 1983	Jan. 1984	Feb. 1984	Feb. 1983	Oct. 1983	Nov. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984	Feb. 1984
Total, 16 years and over	11,516	9,026	8,801	10.4	8.8	8.4	8.2	8.0	7.9
16 to 24 years	4,455	3,537	3,410	18.3	16.3	15.8	14.9	14.8	14.2
16 to 19 years	1,866	1,543	1,553	22.7	21.6	20.2	20.1	19.4	19.3
16 to 17 years	702	649	663	24.0	24.0	21.9	22.9	21.9	22.1
18 to 19 years	1,164	894	891	21.8	20.3	19.3	18.8	17.6	17.5
20 to 24 years	2,589	1,994	1,857	16.1	13.6	13.8	12.2	12.5	11.6
25 years and over	7,060	5,474	5,405	8.2	6.8	6.5	6.4	6.2	6.1
25 to 54 years	6,226	4,789	4,742	8.7	7.2	6.9	6.8	6.5	6.4
55 years and over	815	700	636	5.4	5.0	4.9	4.9	4.7	4.3
Men, 16 years and over	6,756	5,149	4,986	10.8	9.1	8.6	8.3	8.1	7.8
16 to 24 years	2,550	1,971	1,857	19.8	17.3	15.9	15.6	15.6	14.6
16 to 19 years	1,079	889	818	24.0	22.5	20.7	20.4	20.8	19.7
16 to 17 years	400	336	337	26.4	24.3	22.0	23.3	21.6	21.6
18 to 19 years	628	501	469	23.5	21.6	19.6	18.9	19.6	18.1
20 to 24 years	1,511	1,122	1,039	17.6	14.7	13.8	13.3	13.1	12.1
25 years and over	4,213	3,154	3,089	8.5	7.0	6.8	6.5	6.2	6.1
25 to 54 years	3,680	2,783	2,686	9.0	7.4	7.1	6.7	6.6	6.4
55 years and over	517	431	376	5.8	5.9	5.4	5.4	4.8	4.5
Women, 16 years and over	4,760	3,876	3,855	9.9	8.5	8.2	8.1	7.9	7.8
16 to 24 years	1,905	1,566	1,552	16.7	15.1	14.7	14.0	13.9	13.7
16 to 19 years	827	654	735	21.3	20.5	20.1	19.8	18.0	18.3
16 to 17 years	302	313	326	23.6	23.6	21.8	22.5	22.2	22.6
18 to 19 years	526	377	412	19.9	18.8	19.0	18.7	15.8	16.9
20 to 24 years	1,078	872	817	14.1	12.1	12.0	11.0	11.7	11.0
25 years and over	2,867	2,320	2,316	7.0	6.5	6.2	6.2	6.2	6.1
25 to 54 years	2,546	2,006	2,057	8.3	7.0	6.6	6.8	6.5	6.5
55 years and over	298	269	240	4.9	4.3	4.1	4.3	4.5	4.0

[1] Unemployment as a percent of the civilian labor force.

HOUSEHOLD DATA

Table A-10. Employment status of black and other workers

(Numbers in thousands)

Employment status	Not seasonally adjusted			Seasonally adjusted[1]					
	Feb. 1983	Jan. 1984	Feb. 1984	Feb. 1983	Oct. 1983	Nov. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984	Feb. 1984
Civilian noninstitutional population	23,319	23,594	23,600	23,318	23,504	23,527	23,537	23,594	23,600
Civilian labor force	14,279	14,258	14,397	14,450	14,528	14,509	14,535	14,525	14,593
Participation rate	61.2	60.4	61.0	62.0	61.8	61.6	61.7	61.6	61.8
Employed	11,640	12,002	12,237	11,921	12,096	12,171	12,171	12,179	12,417
Employment-population ratio[2]	49.9	50.9	51.9	50.7	51.2	51.5	51.5	51.6	52.6
Unemployed	2,633	2,256	2,159	2,629	2,432	2,338	2,368	2,346	2,176
Unemployment rate	18.4	15.8	15.0	18.2	16.7	16.1	16.3	15.6	14.9
Not in labor force	9,038	9,336	9,204	8,868	9,176	9,118	9,098	9,169	9,007

[1] The population figures are not adjusted for seasonal variation; therefore, identical numbers appear in the unadjusted and seasonally adjusted columns.

[2] Civilian employment as a percent of the civilian noninstitutional population.

Table A-11. Occupational status of the employed and unemployed, not seasonally adjusted

(Numbers in thousands)

Occupation	Civilian employed		Unemployed		Unemployment rate	
	Feb. 1983	Feb. 1984	Feb. 1983	Feb. 1984	Feb. 1983	Feb. 1984
Total, 16 years and over[1]	97,265	101,951	12,382	9,407	11.3	8.4
Managerial and professional specialty	23,415	24,713	840	684	3.5	2.7
Executive, administrative, and managerial	10,421	11,329	451	348	4.1	3.0
Professional specialty	12,994	13,384	389	340	2.9	2.5
Technical, sales, and administrative support	30,394	31,729	2,390	1,893	7.3	5.6
Technicians and related support	3,075	3,117	169	111	5.2	3.4
Sales occupations	11,213	11,984	950	787	7.8	6.2
Administrative support, including clerical	16,106	16,668	1,268	993	7.3	5.6
Service occupations	13,031	13,861	1,730	1,414	11.7	9.3
Private household	953	989	72	73	7.0	6.9
Protective service	1,628	1,673	119	100	6.8	5.7
Service, except private household and protective	10,910	11,799	1,528	1,276	12.3	10.2
Precision production, craft, and repair	11,712	12,557	1,972	1,391	14.4	10.0
Mechanics and repairers	4,082	4,312	441	312	9.7	6.8
Construction trades	3,893	4,140	1,022	706	20.8	13.1
Other precision production, craft, and repair	3,736	4,104	509	333	12.0	7.5
Operators, fabricators, and laborers	15,262	16,190	3,791	2,568	19.9	13.7
Machine operators, assemblers, and inspectors	7,462	7,825	1,814	1,052	19.6	11.9
Transportation and material moving occupations	4,053	4,270	819	541	16.8	11.2
Handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers, and laborers	3,747	4,095	1,158	975	23.6	19.2
Construction laborers	453	569	300	298	39.8	33.5
Other handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers, and laborers	3,294	3,526	849	677	20.7	15.2
Farming, forestry, and fishing	2,986	2,912	491	379	14.1	11.5

[1] Persons with no previous work experience and those whose last job was in the Armed Forces are included in the unemployed total.

HOUSEHOLD DATA

Table A-12. Employment status of male Vietnam-era veterans and nonveterans by age, not seasonally adjusted

[Numbers in thousands]

Veteran status and age	Civilian noninstitutional population		Civilian labor force							
			Total		Employed		Unemployed			
							Number		Percent of labor force	
	Feb. 1983	Feb. 1984	Feb. 1983	Feb. 1984	Feb. 1983	Feb. 1984	Feb. 1983	Feb. 1984	Feb. 1983	Feb. 1984
VETERANS										
Total, 25 years and over	9,270	9,912	7,758	7,988	6,868	6,866	890	562	11.5	7.3
25 to 39 years	6,542	5,651	6,230	5,428	5,465	4,999	765	429	12.3	7.9
25 to 29 years	961	561	890	522	703	460	187	62	21.0	11.9
30 to 34 years	2,508	1,891	2,370	1,797	2,058	1,617	312	180	13.2	10.0
35 to 39 years	3,097	3,199	2,970	3,109	2,704	2,922	266	187	9.0	6.0
40 years and over	1,728	2,261	1,528	1,560	1,403	1,867	125	113	8.2	5.7
NONVETERANS										
Total, 25 to 39 years	19,297	20,702	18,203	19,450	16,129	17,849	2,074	1,601	11.4	8.2
25 to 29 years	8,496	8,866	7,908	8,261	6,827	7,433	1,141	828	14.4	10.0
30 to 34 years	6,842	7,172	6,706	6,772	5,928	6,259	778	513	9.6	7.6
35 to 39 years	3,979	4,664	3,729	4,417	3,374	4,157	355	260	8.6	5.9

NOTE: Male Vietnam-era veterans are men who served in the Armed Forces between August 5, 1964 and May 7, 1975. Nonveterans are men who have never served in the Armed Forces; published data are limited to those 25 to 39 years of age, the group that most closely corresponds to the bulk of the Vietnam-era veteran population.

HOUSEHOLD DATA

HOUSEHOLD DATA

Table A-13. Employment status of the civilian population for ten large States

(Numbers in thousands)

State and employment status	Not seasonally adjusted[1]			Seasonally adjusted[2]					
	Feb. 1983	Jan. 1984	Feb. 1984	Feb. 1983	Oct. 1983	Nov. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984	Feb. 1984
California									
Civilian noninstitutional population	18,668	18,983	19,009	18,668	18,905	18,930	18,954	18,983	19,009
Civilian labor force	12,214	12,358	12,380	12,276	12,311	12,408	12,384	12,395	12,364
Employed	10,965	11,226	11,226	10,918	11,229	11,367	11,388	11,350	11,380
Unemployed	1,452	1,132	1,082	1,356	1,054	1,041	1,001	1,045	983
Unemployment rate	11.9	9.2	8.8	11.0	8.6	8.4	8.1	8.4	8.0
Florida									
Civilian noninstitutional population	8,270	8,455	8,471	8,270	8,400	8,418	8,435	8,455	8,471
Civilian labor force	4,682	4,984	4,991	4,749	4,938	5,009	5,007	5,067	5,065
Employed	4,238	4,617	4,685	4,305	4,537	4,619	4,717	4,713	4,760
Unemployed	444	367	306	444	401	390	290	354	305
Unemployment rate	9.5	7.4	6.1	9.3	8.1	7.8	5.8	7.0	6.0
Illinois									
Civilian noninstitutional population	8,565	8,588	8,590	8,565	8,585	8,586	8,586	8,588	8,590
Civilian labor force	5,587	5,504	5,549	5,639	5,537	5,544	5,540	5,553	5,599
Employed	4,815	4,915	4,990	4,893	4,979	5,011	5,008	5,005	5,067
Unemployed	772	589	559	746	548	533	532	548	532
Unemployment rate	13.8	10.7	10.1	13.2	9.9	9.6	9.6	9.9	9.5
Massachusetts									
Civilian noninstitutional population	4,473	4,499	4,501	4,473	4,496	4,496	4,497	4,499	4,501
Civilian labor force	2,888	3,011	2,986	2,932	2,991	3,014	3,017	3,028	3,011
Employed	2,652	2,790	2,797	2,712	2,787	2,814	2,823	2,831	2,860
Unemployed	236	221	189	220	204	200	194	197	151
Unemployment rate	8.2	7.3	6.3	7.5	6.8	6.6	6.4	6.5	5.0
Michigan									
Civilian noninstitutional population	6,749	6,736	6,733	6,749	6,742	6,740	6,737	6,736	6,733
Civilian labor force	4,248	4,146	4,245	4,185	4,252	4,236	4,241	4,202	4,305
Employed	3,547	3,616	3,708	3,650	3,687	3,696	3,748	3,722	3,815
Unemployed	701	530	535	655	565	520	493	480	490
Unemployment rate	16.5	12.8	12.6	15.2	13.3	12.3	11.6	11.5	11.4
New Jersey									
Civilian noninstitutional population	5,729	5,776	5,779	5,729	5,766	5,769	5,772	5,776	5,779
Civilian labor force	3,565	3,750	3,761	3,615	3,661	3,685	3,762	3,774	3,811
Employed	3,240	3,464	3,508	3,305	3,405	3,429	3,503	3,503	3,575
Unemployed	325	287	253	310	256	257	259	271	236
Unemployment rate	9.1	7.6	6.7	8.6	7.0	7.0	6.9	7.2	6.2
New York									
Civilian noninstitutional population	13,524	13,605	13,609	13,524	13,592	13,596	13,599	13,605	13,609
Civilian labor force	7,896	7,888	7,995	7,921	8,098	8,098	8,056	7,919	8,026
Employed	7,144	7,251	7,346	7,226	7,448	7,476	7,455	7,353	7,432
Unemployed	752	637	649	695	650	622	601	586	592
Unemployment rate	9.5	8.1	8.1	8.8	8.0	7.7	7.5	7.4	7.4
Ohio									
Civilian noninstitutional population	8,048	8,050	8,050	8,048	8,051	8,051	8,050	8,050	8,050
Civilian labor force	4,913	4,964	4,925	5,066	5,110	5,113	5,097	5,095	5,082
Employed	4,202	4,452	4,426	4,379	4,543	4,557	4,561	4,619	4,607
Unemployed	711	512	499	687	567	556	536	476	475
Unemployment rate	14.5	10.3	10.1	13.6	11.1	10.9	10.5	9.3	9.3
Pennsylvania									
Civilian noninstitutional population	9,170	9,198	9,200	9,170	9,194	9,195	9,196	9,198	9,200
Civilian labor force	5,381	5,383	5,366	5,455	5,532	5,554	5,519	5,451	5,421
Employed	4,621	4,841	4,758	4,745	4,960	4,969	4,963	4,997	4,888
Unemployed	760	542	586	710	572	585	556	454	533
Unemployment rate	14.1	10.1	11.0	13.0	10.3	10.5	10.4	8.3	9.8
Texas									
Civilian noninstitutional population	11,156	11,429	11,455	11,156	11,353	11,378	11,402	11,429	11,455
Civilian labor force	7,553	7,635	7,625	7,561	7,666	7,657	7,743	7,668	7,632
Employed	6,885	7,079	7,175	6,909	7,092	7,126	7,146	7,118	7,199
Unemployed	667	556	450	652	574	531	597	550	433
Unemployment rate	8.8	7.3	5.9	8.6	7.5	7.0	7.7	6.9	5.7

[1] These are the official Bureau of Labor Statistics' estimates used in the administration of Federal fund allocation programs.

[2] The population figures are not adjusted for seasonal variation; therefore, identical numbers appear in the unadjusted and the seasonally adjusted columns.

ESTABLISHMENT DATA

Table B-1. Employees on nonagricultural payrolls by industry

(In thousands)

Industry	Not seasonally adjusted				Seasonally adjusted					
	Feb. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984 p	Feb. 1984 p	Feb. 1983	Oct. 1983	Nov. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984 p	Feb. 1984 p
Total	87,613	92,247	90,572	91,033	88,746	91,084	91,355	91,599	91,863	92,249
Total private	71,625	76,270	74,853	75,061	73,004	75,312	75,579	75,829	76,148	76,533
Goods-producing	22,454	24,335	23,982	24,196	23,049	24,168	24,311	24,415	24,611	24,760
Mining	1,001	1,045	1,042	1,040	1,014	1,041	1,045	1,047	1,050	1,053
Oil and gas extraction	640	659	660	657	645	648	655	663	661	661
Construction	3,376	4,035	3,771	3,753	3,790	4,060	4,094	4,088	4,176	4,212
General building contractors	867	1,077	1,011	1,004	961	1,052	1,062	1,075	1,105	1,112
Manufacturing	18,077	19,233	19,169	19,308	18,245	19,064	19,172	19,280	19,385	19,495
Production workers	12,157	13,180	13,124	13,256	12,303	13,043	13,147	13,230	13,321	13,418
Durable goods	10,523	11,379	11,363	11,473	10,608	11,235	11,320	11,406	11,474	11,575
Production workers	6,876	7,637	7,626	7,726	6,949	7,522	7,601	7,665	7,726	7,813
Lumber and wood products	609.5	699.1	686.6	691.3	631	712	714	715	714	716
Furniture and fixtures	426.8	477.0	476.4	480.2	427	465	470	473	476	481
Stone, clay, and glass products	531.9	583.2	569.7	574.7	557	590	590	589	593	602
Primary metal industries	908.6	868.2	869.4	876.4	810	867	871	881	872	879
Blast furnaces and basic steel products	324.5	339.1	338.1	340.1	323	344	342	343	337	339
Fabricated metal products	1,357.2	1,449.2	1,447.1	1,459.0	1,364	1,430	1,438	1,449	1,459	1,466
Machinery, except electrical	2,045.5	2,175.9	2,186.3	2,206.2	2,042	2,131	2,154	2,172	2,188	2,202
Electrical and electronic equipment	1,972.7	2,149.9	2,160.9	2,184.1	1,981	2,107	2,128	2,146	2,167	2,195
Transportation equipment	1,714.5	1,885.2	1,882.9	1,911.5	1,729	1,848	1,862	1,887	1,906	1,929
Motor vehicles and equipment	711.7	849.4	845.7	863.5	724	817	821	846	870	879
Instruments and related products	689.9	702.0	702.9	705.0	693	699	701	701	706	709
Miscellaneous manufacturing	386.1	388.9	380.7	386.9	374	386	388	393	393	396
Nondurable goods	7,554	7,856	7,806	7,833	7,637	7,829	7,852	7,874	7,911	7,920
Production workers	5,281	5,543	5,498	5,530	5,354	5,521	5,546	5,565	5,595	5,605
Food and kindred products	1,364.2	1,620.3	1,589.3	1,577.4	1,620	1,628	1,633	1,632	1,642	1,635
Tobacco manufactures	66.7	63.5	64.1	61.8	67	64	61	62	62	62
Textile mill products	723.0	762.0	759.9	759.1	736	759	758	759	766	762
Apparel and other textile products	1,144.7	1,194.1	1,188.6	1,206.8	1,148	1,191	1,199	1,206	1,210	1,210
Paper and allied products	646.6	669.4	666.2	668.7	652	665	666	670	670	674
Printing and publishing	1,265.3	1,312.2	1,309.1	1,314.6	1,264	1,297	1,301	1,303	1,309	1,313
Chemicals and allied products	1,051.3	1,060.4	1,057.2	1,061.3	1,056	1,061	1,061	1,064	1,065	1,066
Petroleum and coal products	194.7	190.5	187.8	187.2	199	193	193	192	192	192
Rubber and miscellaneous plastics products	686.5	766.0	770.2	781.0	691	753	762	769	777	787
Leather and leather products	210.8	215.6	213.4	214.7	214	218	218	217	218	219
Service-producing	65,159	67,912	66,590	66,932	65,697	66,916	67,044	67,184	67,252	67,489
Transportation and public utilities	4,896	5,043	4,976	4,972	4,966	5,019	5,019	5,015	5,043	5,043
Transportation	2,640	2,781	2,731	2,728	2,694	2,754	2,749	2,747	2,784	2,783
Communication and public utilities	2,256	2,265	2,245	2,244	2,272	2,265	2,270	2,269	2,259	2,260
Wholesale trade	5,134	5,324	5,298	5,308	5,181	5,287	5,291	5,313	5,341	5,336
Durable goods	2,998	3,131	3,127	3,142	3,017	3,108	3,114	3,132	3,145	3,162
Nondurable goods	2,136	2,193	2,171	2,166	2,164	2,179	2,178	2,182	2,195	2,194
Retail trade	14,736	16,025	15,288	15,122	15,162	15,379	15,427	15,468	15,505	15,558
General merchandise stores	2,118	2,554	2,315	2,205	2,180	2,231	2,246	2,228	2,254	2,268
Food stores	2,448	2,561	2,511	2,503	2,477	2,509	2,510	2,509	2,526	2,533
Automotive dealers and service stations	1,575	1,639	1,639	1,640	1,596	1,635	1,636	1,639	1,645	1,663
Eating and drinking places	4,643	4,870	4,684	4,680	4,872	4,899	4,899	4,910	4,925	4,911
Finance, insurance, and real estate	5,340	5,508	5,514	5,518	5,384	5,503	5,515	5,525	5,553	5,563
Finance	2,669	2,768	2,771	2,776	2,674	2,738	2,763	2,767	2,777	2,781
Insurance	1,705	1,718	1,722	1,723	1,710	1,715	1,717	1,718	1,729	1,728
Real estate	966	1,022	1,022	1,019	1,000	1,030	1,035	1,040	1,047	1,054
Services	19,065	20,033	19,795	20,040	19,262	19,956	20,016	20,093	20,096	20,242
Business services	3,338	3,846	3,819	3,841	3,385	3,729	3,748	3,808	3,838	3,895
Health services	5,870	5,988	5,980	5,987	5,887	5,985	5,983	5,994	5,992	6,005
Government	15,988	15,977	15,719	15,972	15,742	15,772	15,776	15,770	15,715	15,727
Federal	2,728	2,754	2,741	2,746	2,742	2,761	2,763	2,768	2,763	2,760
State	3,714	3,721	3,590	3,711	3,633	3,646	3,646	3,646	3,614	3,631
Local	9,546	9,501	9,388	9,515	9,367	9,365	9,367	9,356	9,338	9,336

p = preliminary.

ESTABLISHMENT DATA

Table B-2. Average weekly hours of production or nonsupervisory workers[1] on private nonagricultural payrolls by industry

Industry	Not seasonally adjusted				Seasonally adjusted					
	Feb. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984 p	Feb. 1984 p	Feb. 1983	Oct. 1983	Nov. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984 p	Feb. 1984 p
Total private	34.2	35.5	35.0	35.1	34.5	35.3	35.2	35.3	35.5	35.4
Mining	41.3	43.5	43.6	43.5	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Construction	35.4	36.8	36.3	36.9	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Manufacturing	38.8	41.2	40.5	40.7	39.2	40.6	40.6	40.5	41.0	41.0
Overtime hours	2.3	3.6	3.3	3.4	2.4	3.3	3.3	3.4	3.5	3.6
Durable goods	39.4	42.0	41.3	41.4	39.7	41.2	41.2	41.1	41.7	41.7
Overtime hours	2.2	3.8	3.5	3.8	2.3	3.4	3.5	3.5	3.7	3.7
Lumber and wood products	38.8	39.8	39.1	39.5	39.3	40.1	39.7	39.7	40.7	40.2
Furniture and fixtures	37.4	41.0	39.1	39.3	37.9	39.8	39.7	40.1	40.3	39.9
Stone, clay, and glass products	39.4	41.9	40.8	41.4	40.5	41.7	41.7	41.6	42.1	42.5
Primary metal industries	39.1	42.2	41.7	42.0	39.1	41.7	41.6	41.8	41.7	42.0
Blast furnaces and basic steel products	37.7	41.3	40.6	41.3	37.6	40.8	40.4	41.3	40.5	41.2
Fabricated metal products	39.2	42.3	41.4	41.4	39.6	41.2	41.4	41.4	41.8	41.8
Machinery, except electrical	39.4	42.6	41.9	42.1	39.4	41.3	41.3	41.4	41.9	42.1
Electrical and electronic equipment	39.3	41.8	41.1	41.1	39.5	41.1	41.1	40.9	41.3	41.3
Transportation equipment	40.9	43.3	42.8	42.8	41.2	42.5	42.5	41.9	43.3	43.1
Motor vehicles and equipment	41.8	44.6	44.3	44.1	42.2	43.7	43.8	42.5	45.4	44.5
Instruments and related products	39.6	41.4	41.0	40.8	39.7	40.7	40.6	40.7	41.3	40.9
Miscellaneous manufacturing	37.7	40.1	39.1	39.9	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Nondurable goods	38.2	40.2	39.5	39.7	38.5	39.7	39.7	39.7	40.0	40.1
Overtime hours	2.4	3.3	3.1	3.1	2.6	3.1	3.1	3.2	3.2	3.3
Food and kindred products	38.5	40.1	39.4	39.3	39.0	39.7	39.5	39.6	39.6	39.9
Tobacco manufactures	34.1	37.8	37.5	35.9	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Textile mill products	38.7	41.0	40.2	40.4	39.0	40.7	40.7	40.7	41.0	40.7
Apparel and other textile products	34.8	36.7	36.1	36.7	35.2	36.5	36.4	36.5	37.1	37.1
Paper and allied products	41.1	43.8	43.1	43.1	41.4	43.2	43.0	43.0	43.2	43.5
Printing and publishing	36.8	38.4	37.4	37.6	37.1	38.0	37.9	37.6	37.8	37.9
Chemicals and allied products	40.9	42.4	42.0	41.9	41.0	41.7	41.8	41.9	42.2	42.1
Petroleum and coal products	43.3	44.4	44.4	44.6	44.4	43.5	43.6	44.5	45.6	45.7
Rubber and miscellaneous plastics products	39.7	42.5	42.1	42.2	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Leather and leather products	34.6	37.3	36.5	36.7	34.9	37.5	37.2	37.0	37.1	37.0
Transportation and public utilities	38.4	39.7	39.2	39.2	38.6	39.4	39.2	39.4	39.6	39.4
Wholesale trade	37.9	39.0	38.6	38.5	38.2	38.7	38.7	38.7	38.8	38.8
Retail trade	28.7	30.8	29.4	29.4	29.3	30.0	30.0	30.4	30.1	30.0
Finance, insurance, and real estate	36.1	36.2	36.5	36.2	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Services	32.4	32.6	32.6	32.5	32.5	32.9	32.7	32.6	32.8	32.6

[1] Data relate to production workers in mining and manufacturing; to construction workers in construction; and to nonsupervisory workers in transportation and public utilities; wholesale and retail trade; finance, insurance, and real estate; and services. These groups account for approximately four-fifths of the total employees on private nonagricultural payrolls.

[2] This series is not published seasonally adjusted since the seasonal component is small relative to the trend-cycle and/or irregular components and consequently cannot be separated with sufficient precision.

p = preliminary.

ESTABLISHMENT DATA

Table B-3. Average hourly and weekly earnings of production or nonsupervisory workers[1] on private nonagricultural payrolls by industry

Industry	Average hourly earnings				Average weekly earnings			
	Feb. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984 p	Feb. 1984 p	Feb. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984 p	Feb. 1984 p
Total private	7.92	8.16	8.23	8.24	$279.86	$289.68	$288.75	$289.22
Seasonally adjusted	7.91	8.16	8.22	8.23	272.90	288.05	291.81	291.34
Mining	11.23	11.44	11.54	11.48	484.63	497.64	503.14	496.51
Construction	12.00	12.01	12.05	11.93	424.80	441.97	437.42	440.22
Manufacturing	8.75	9.06	9.09	9.09	339.50	373.27	368.15	369.96
Durable goods	9.31	9.63	9.66	9.66	366.51	404.46	398.96	399.92
Lumber and wood products	7.72	7.80	7.86	7.90	298.54	310.44	308.90	312.05
Furniture and fixtures	6.50	6.77	6.76	6.76	243.10	277.57	284.32	285.67
Stone, clay, and glass products	9.10	9.41	9.43	9.42	358.54	394.28	384.76	389.99
Primary metal industries	11.53	11.35	11.38	11.45	450.82	478.97	474.55	480.90
Blast furnaces and basic steel products	13.72	12.74	12.79	12.94	517.24	526.16	519.27	536.42
Fabricated metal products	9.06	9.38	9.34	9.34	346.17	396.77	386.68	386.68
Machinery, except electrical	9.44	9.91	9.91	9.93	371.94	422.17	415.23	418.05
Electrical and electronic equipment	8.56	8.86	8.90	8.88	336.41	370.35	365.79	364.97
Transportation equipment	11.49	12.06	12.07	12.08	469.94	522.20	516.60	517.02
Motor vehicles and equipment	11.89	12.45	12.56	12.48	497.00	557.05	555.52	550.37
Instruments and related products	8.48	8.70	8.73	8.69	335.81	320.18	357.93	354.55
Miscellaneous manufacturing	6.73	6.97	7.05	7.03	253.72	279.50	275.66	280.50
Nondurable goods	7.99	8.24	8.27	8.26	305.22	331.25	326.67	327.92
Food and kindred products	8.11	8.33	8.38	8.41	312.24	334.03	330.17	330.51
Tobacco manufactures	9.96	10.18	10.58	10.78	339.64	384.80	396.75	387.00
Textile mill products	6.10	6.31	6.40	6.41	236.07	258.71	257.28	258.96
Apparel and other textile products	5.33	5.46	5.51	5.49	185.48	200.38	198.91	201.48
Paper and allied products	9.65	10.23	10.22	10.22	396.62	448.07	440.48	440.48
Printing and publishing	8.99	9.31	9.28	9.30	330.83	357.50	347.07	349.68
Chemicals and allied products	10.41	10.89	10.89	10.89	425.77	461.74	457.38	456.29
Petroleum and coal products	13.25	13.57	13.42	13.28	573.73	602.51	598.53	592.29
Rubber and miscellaneous plastics products	7.91	8.18	8.21	8.23	314.03	347.65	345.64	347.31
Leather and leather products	5.50	5.60	5.69	5.68	190.30	208.88	207.69	208.46
Transportation and public utilities	10.72	10.98	11.04	11.01	411.65	435.91	432.77	431.59
Wholesale trade	8.28	8.68	8.67	8.63	313.81	335.40	334.66	332.26
Retail trade	5.69	5.77	5.89	5.88	163.30	177.72	173.17	172.87
Finance, insurance, and real estate	7.22	7.42	7.58	7.58	260.64	288.97	276.67	274.40
Services	7.19	7.44	7.53	7.52	232.96	242.54	245.48	244.40

[1] See footnote 1, table B-2.

p = preliminary.

Table B-4. Hourly Earnings Index for production or nonsupervisory workers[1] on private nonagricultural payrolls by industry

(1977 = 100)

Industry	Not seasonally adjusted					Seasonally adjusted						
	Feb. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984p	Feb. 1984p	Percent change from: Feb. 1983–Feb. 1984	Feb. 1983	Oct. 1983	Nov. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984p	Feb. 1984p	Percent change from: Jan. 1984–Feb. 1984
Total private nonfarm:												
Current dollars	153.7	157.6	158.8	158.6	3.2	153.4	156.8	156.9	157.6	158.2	158.2	(2)
Constant (1977) dollars	95.5	94.9	95.2	N.A.	(3)	95.1	94.6	94.4	94.7	94.7	N.A.	(4)
Mining	163.1	170.1	170.7	169.9	2.9	(5)	(5)	(5)	(5)	(5)	(5)	(5)
Construction	144.6	145.8	146.0	144.6	(2)	145.7	145.1	144.6	145.2	145.9	145.5	-0.3
Manufacturing	157.3	160.5	161.1	161.2	2.5	157.3	158.9	159.7	160.1	160.7	161.2	.3
Transportation and public utilities	155.7	159.6	160.5	160.3	2.9	155.2	158.4	158.7	158.9	159.9	159.5	-.2
Wholesale and retail trade	149.8	154.0	155.5	155.2	3.7	149.3	154.1	154.1	154.8	155.0	154.7	-.2
Finance, insurance, and real estate	157.4	162.0	165.1	165.0	4.8	(5)	(5)	(5)	(5)	(5)	(5)	(5)
Services	153.4	159.2	160.9	160.6	4.7	152.4	158.4	158.1	159.2	159.6	159.5	-.1

1 See footnote 1, table B-2.
2 Percent change is less than .05 percent.
3 Percent change was -0.1 percent from January 1983 to January 1984, the latest month available.
4 Percent change was 0.3 percent from January 1983 to January 1984, the latest month available.
5 These series are not seasonally adjusted since the seasonal component is small relative to the trend-cycle and/or irregular components and consequently cannot be separated with sufficient precision.

N.A. = not available.
p = preliminary.

ESTABLISHMENT DATA

Table B-5. Indexes of aggregate weekly hours of production or nonsupervisory workers[1] on private nonagricultural payrolls by industry

(1977 = 100)

Industry	Not seasonally adjusted				Seasonally adjusted					
	Feb. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984 p	Feb. 1984 p	Feb. 1983	Oct. 1983	Nov. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984 p	Feb. 1984 p
Total	99.1	110.4	96.4	106.8	103.2	108.1	108.3	108.9	110.1	110.2
Goods-producing	83.3	97.7	94.5	95.6	97.2	93.6	96.3	96.8	99.4	100.1
Mining	108.5	120.7	120.6	120.0	111.6	118.3	118.1	118.9	122.6	122.7
Construction	80.0	104.5	94.1	94.8	94.7	103.9	105.2	105.6	113.5	113.2
Manufacturing	82.8	93.3	93.3	94.6	84.1	92.9	93.3	94.0	93.8	96.3
Durable goods	79.5	94.2	92.4	93.9	80.4	91.1	91.9	92.6	94.6	95.7
Lumber and wood products	79.4	95.0	91.8	92.9	83.1	98.0	97.0	97.2	99.5	98.4
Furniture and fixtures	84.4	104.9	99.9	101.5	84.7	99.1	100.1	101.7	103.0	102.1
Stone, clay, and glass products	71.3	85.1	80.4	82.4	76.6	83.9	86.1	85.5	87.1	89.6
Primary metal industries	61.1	72.8	72.5	73.6	61.0	71.6	72.1	73.6	72.6	73.8
Blast furnaces and basic steel products	51.5	61.3	60.4	61.6	51.0	60.7	60.7	61.9	60.0	61.1
Fabricated metal products	77.9	91.3	89.2	90.3	78.9	87.6	88.5	89.6	91.2	91.8
Machinery, except electrical	79.0	93.7	93.2	95.0	78.4	88.3	90.0	91.0	93.2	94.7
Electrical and electronic equipment	93.2	110.8	109.7	111.1	93.2	106.5	108.0	108.2	110.6	112.2
Transportation equipment	79.1	95.6	94.1	95.9	80.1	91.1	92.0	92.5	96.9	97.7
Motor vehicles and equipment	68.4	91.1	89.8	91.5	69.8	84.7	85.4	86.1	95.2	96.0
Instruments and related products	99.3	106.7	106.0	106.2	99.1	103.1	103.1	104.8	107.4	107.2
Miscellaneous manufacturing	75.3	87.1	82.7	86.0	77.7	85.0	85.4	87.2	87.5	89.5
Nondurable goods	87.8	97.0	96.6	95.5	89.6	95.6	95.8	96.3	97.5	97.8
Food and kindred products	88.4	96.2	92.4	91.2	93.8	95.8	95.9	96.0	97.0	97.0
Tobacco manufactures	81.6	88.4	85.1	77.1	82.4	84.7	83.4	82.8	83.6	79.9
Textile mill products	74.9	84.5	82.6	83.1	75.4	83.4	83.5	83.7	85.1	84.1
Apparel and other textile products	83.7	93.2	90.4	93.6	85.0	91.7	92.1	92.9	95.4	94.9
Paper and allied products	89.1	98.9	97.0	97.6	90.4	96.8	96.6	97.4	98.0	99.5
Printing and publishing	104.8	114.3	110.8	111.8	105.6	111.3	111.8	110.9	112.0	112.4
Chemicals and allied products	92.9	97.7	96.1	97.0	93.6	95.9	96.2	96.8	97.5	97.9
Petroleum and coal products	90.1	88.9	86.8	87.8	96.2	89.9	89.4	90.4	91.0	93.7
Rubber and miscellaneous plastics products	91.2	110.6	110.0	112.3	90.9	106.7	108.0	109.6	111.2	113.7
Leather and leather products	75.1	83.5	80.6	81.6	76.4	83.1	84.4	83.5	84.2	84.0
Service-producing	107.8	117.5	113.1	113.0	110.5	115.1	114.9	115.6	115.9	115.9
Transportation and public utilities	96.6	103.0	100.0	99.9	98.6	101.8	101.1	101.7	102.6	101.9
Wholesale trade	103.9	110.9	109.2	109.1	105.5	109.5	109.6	109.9	110.9	111.1
Retail trade	96.3	113.1	102.4	101.1	100.8	105.6	105.7	107.3	106.4	106.4
Finance, insurance, and real estate	113.6	120.0	120.7	119.7	116.4	120.3	119.8	120.5	121.5	121.0
Services	121.0	128.0	126.2	127.6	122.5	128.6	128.2	128.3	129.1	129.2

[1] See footnote 1, table B-2

p = preliminary.

Table B-6. Indexes of diffusion: Percent of industries in which employment[1] increased

Time span	Year	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.
Over 1-month span	1981	28.5	45.4	36.0	39.0	47.6	32.8	38.4	37.1	34.1	29.3	32.0	42.2
	1982	58.5	45.7	62.4	69.1	71.0	64.5	68.5	68.0	60.8	70.7	64.5	64.0
	1983	67.2p	70.2p										
Over 3-month span	1981	25.3	28.8	32.0	34.1	32.5	33.6	27.2	27.2	26.1	25.5	24.7	40.6
	1982	45.4	55.1	65.6	75.8	76.1	77.2	73.9	79.6	79.6	74.2	72.0	74.2p
	1983	78.5p											
Over 6-month span	1981	20.2	23.7	25.3	29.8	26.1	26.1	23.4	19.1	21.2	26.1	26.6	35.8
	1982	50.5	63.2	73.4	76.3	79.3	83.6	82.5	80.4	82.0	82.8p	82.8p	
	1983												
Over 12-month span	1981	22.0	20.7	18.0	19.4	18.3	20.7	20.7	22.8	24.2	31.5	37.6	44.1
	1982	48.9	38.3	62.6	73.4	76.1	81.2	84.9p	87.1p				
	1983												

[1] Number of employees, seasonally adjusted for 1, 3, and 6 month spans, on payrolls of 186 private nonagricultural industries.

p = preliminary.

NOTE: Figures are the percent of industries with employment rising. (Half of the unchanged components are counted as rising.) Data are centered within the spans.

Senator JEPSEN. Ms. Norwood, I thank you for your testimony and your report.

I am quite concerned about the ability of veterans to find employment. How are the veterans doing in this recovery compared to adult males as a whole? Do you have a breakdown of that?

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes, sir, we do. At least over the year I can tell you that the veteran population 25 years and over have had a considerable decline in their unemployment rate, 11.5 to 7.3 percent. Our data suggest that as veterans progress in age and gain experience in the labor force, their employment experience tends to be very similar to that of nonveterans of the same age group. It is the younger veterans—those most recently discharged—who have the greatest difficulties.

Senator JEPSEN. Anticipating some of the possible criticisms, would you please give me your opinion on whether the relatively mild February weather that we experienced this year might result in an increase in the February seasonally adjusted employment level?

Ms. NORWOOD. It is entirely possible. Seasonal adjustment, as you know, is not a very perfect art. We think we do a pretty good job of seasonal adjustment. The data do show very strong employment growth, particularly in the household survey. On the other hand, we do see support for very strong job growth from the establishment survey. So my view is that the labor market has improved a great deal and that employment growth has occurred. I don't know whether it's 700,000 exactly, as the household survey suggests; that may be a slight overstatement. But that is on the employment side. The decline in the unemployment rate is very real.

Senator JEPSEN. We have had, as you indicated, several consecutive months of falling unemployment. In the month of December we had a drop in unemployment. Did we have an increase in the number of people employed in December?

Ms. NORWOOD. We have had increases in the number of people employed in each of the months since the recovery began. We have had sizable increases, actually, beginning in January 1983. So it has been consistent; there has been a consistent increase in employment and there has been a very consistent and continuous decline in the unemployment rate.

Senator JEPSEN. When the worst weather came we showed progress. February was unseasonably mild, as someone might say, but we also have had improvement across the board for sometime. This is broad and deep and sustained. We've been hearing the words "sustainable economic recovery" for sometime. The Reaganomics, which you don't hear much about anymore, would seem to be working. The President's policies, both fiscal and monetary, and the consistency and the resolve that has been demonstrated for many months now are resulting in increased productivity and the work ethic coming back into vogue again. One of the best kept secrets for a long time was economic recovery, but now that it is busting out into its full bloom, we find a recordbreaking number of people being employed in this country; we find one month after another with increased positive signs and with real jobs being created. How many miliion jobs do we have this February that we did

not have 12 months ago? In other words, in the 12-month period February to February, how many new jobs were created?

Ms. NORWOOD. We have 3.4 to 4.7 million jobs more this February than last February, depending on which survey you look at. There are some differences, as you know, between the two in definition.

Senator JEPSEN. Depending on the survey, we have 3.5 million to 4.5 million new jobs. If anyone were to debate the statistics of whether we have new jobs or not they would have to debate it on the basis of whether it was 3.5 million new or 4.5 million, is that correct?

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes, sir. We're in a recovery and we have had strong growth during this recovery.

Senator JEPSEN. Senator Proxmire.

Senator PROXMIRE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Ms. Norwood, I agree with you and the chairman's fine statement. The data seem to be very encouraging.

I have some questions that go to how encouraging it is, but before I do that, the remark that you have in your oral statement, where you say, "It is unlikely that increases of the magnitude of the February labor force change will be sustained in later months" suggests that that's another reason why we should expect unemployment to continue to decline. Unemployment is a lagging indicator. As the chairman has pointed out, the leading indicators are positive. The sales-inventory ratio is highly favorable, very favorable, more favorable than it has ever been, and it would appear that we could expect probably to have another 6 or 8 months, at least, of continued good news on the unemployment front. Is that a fair conclusion on the basis of past experience? Of course, noboby can see the future. You might have a reverse situation. But on the basis of our past experience, do these factors suggest unemployment is likely to continue to decline over the next 6 or 8 months?

Ms. NORWOOD. On the basis of past experience it is quite clear that this is a very strong, robust recovery.

Senator PROXMIRE. The leading indicators usually have been pretty accurate, and unemployment is a lagging indicator, right?

Ms. NORWOOD. Well, at times it lags; sometimes it is coincident. But in any case I think that I will stick with what we have here, which is a very strong employment rate.

Senator PROXMIRE. I notice in the table that follows your presentation you show the unadjusted rate of unemployment. If you don't have seasonal factors in it at all, unemployment was substantially higher in February than it was in December, unadjusted, and it was higher than it was in November, unadjusted. It was about the size it was in October. In other words, it was 8.4 percent, unadjusted. So it's the seasonal factor that brought it down to 7.8 percent; is that right?

Ms. NORWOOD. Correct.

Senator PROXMIRE. Therefore, on the chairman's question on the weather in February—as you say you can't give a precise estimate as to what effect this might have—but it's conceivable that it might have made that 7.8-percent figure somewhat less. Is it possible that it could have changed the figures so that there would have been no real improvement in unemployment in February or not?

Ms. NORWOOD. No, I don't think so, Senator Proxmire. January and February are the big months for seasonal adjustment. But between January and February there is a very small seasonal adjustment.

Senator PROXMIRE. Let me try to put some of this into perspective. We have had the biggest fiscal stimulus to our economy and to the industry of our country, a colossal deficit, increasing from a $58 billion deficit in 1981 to $109 billion deficit in 1982 to $195 billion deficit in 1983. Obviously that has an effect in stimulating economic activity. Keep that in mind.

Now in the second place, in his 1980 debate with President Carter, President Reagan asked, "Is there more or less unemployment in this country than there was 4 years ago?"

I have several questions on how the current unemployment situation compares with that of January 1981 when President Reagan took office.

In January 1981 there were 8.1 million persons out of work. How many were there last month?

Ms. NORWOOD. There were 8.8 million.

Senator PROXMIRE. There were 8.8 million out of work?

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes, sir.

Senator PROXMIRE. So there were 700,000 more out of work.

In January 1981 there were 4.5 million men out of work. How many were there last month?

Ms. NORWOOD. There were 4.13 million adult men.

Senator PROXMIRE. Sixteen and over?

Ms. NORWOOD. Almost 5 million; 4.950 million.

Senator PROXMIRE. That was approximately the figure I had for 16 and over for 1981. So that's a comparable figure. There were a half million more people out of work last month than there were in January 1981.

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes.

Senator PROXMIRE. In January 1981 there were 3.6 million women 16 and over out of work. How many were there last month?

Ms. NORWOOD. Almost 3.9 million.

Senator PROXMIRE. So there were 300,000 more women out of work.

In January 1981 there were 6.3 million whites out of work. How many white last month?

Ms. NORWOOD. There were 6.6 million.

Senator PROXMIRE. So there were 300,000 more whites.

In January 1981, there were 1.6 million blacks out of work. How many were there last month?

Ms. NORWOOD. There were 1.9 million.

Senator PROXMIRE. So there were 300,000 more blacks out of work. Of course, that's a much smaller population.

In January 1981 there were 1.3 million persons who had been out of work for 27 weeks or more. How many were there last month?

Ms. NORWOOD. There were 1.8 million.

Senator PROXMIRE. So there were 500,000 who had been out of work for half a year or more.

In January 1981 the average duration of unemployment was 14.3 weeks. What was it last month?

Ms. NORWOOD. It was 18.8 weeks.

Senator PROXMIRE. In January 1981, there were 4 million of the unemployed who were job losers. How many were there last month?

Ms. NORWOOD. There were 4.7 million.

Senator PROXMIRE. So 700,000 more were job losers. So is it true, then, that by each of these eight measures there is currently more unemployment in the country than there was in January 1981?

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes, sir.

Senator PROXMIRE. I am concerned with another economic element which is a concern to all Americans, and that is inflation. We have seen some changes in the price level recently, and it is hard to say how significant those are, because undoubtedly changes in the price of food, for example, may be just temporary. Nevertheless, there are some basic changes here that suggest inflation may be a problem. Productivity growth helps hold down labor costs, but productivity has grown by less in this recovery than in the previous ones. This suggests that inflationary labor market pressures will be recurring sooner than usual.

Ms. NORWOOD. I don't think so. Unit labor costs are behaving reasonably well. Certainly the deceleration in inflation has been accompanied by a deceleration in many labor costs, which is an important part of the upward pressure on inflation.

Senator PROXMIRE. By labor costs, are you talking productivity and the changing wage rates?

Ms. NORWOOD. Unit labor costs.

Senator PROXMIRE. In comparing the increase in productivity, in 1954–55 there was a 5-percent improvement; 1958–59, 4.9; 1961–62, 5.5; 1970–71, 3.7; 1975–76, 5.1. And this is the lowest of all, 3.5; it's the weakest improvement in productivity we have had. Certainly the lack of improvement in productivity is not an encouraging element as far as inflation is concerned. Isn't that right?

Ms. NORWOOD. As you know, Senator, we have had for many years a concern about the slowdown in productivity growth.

Senator PROXMIRE. That's right, but this is the lowest we have had on the basis of any experience in the last 30 years.

You give considerable and proper emphasis to the employment-population ratio, and I think it's an important figure that most of us ignore. It is now 1 point below the all-time high, and for women, you tell us, at a record high. Geoffrey Moore, one of your predecessors, believes that that is a key indicator of future inflationary pressures. I want to know if you agree with that and if you will put it in perspective with the fact that on the other hand we still have a high level of unemployment, higher than usual.

Ms. NORWOOD. I am not sure that I believe that one can relate it quite clearly to inflationary pressure.

Senator PROXMIRE. Isn't it logical that as you have a greater and greater percent of the people working it is more difficult for employers to hire, to get the kind of skilled people they want, and they are talking about paying more and bidding against each other?

Ms. NORWOOD. Sure.

Senator PROXMIRE. Isn't a fundamental element of inflation wage increases, and aren't wage increases more likely as unemployment diminishes?

Ms. NORWOOD. That is certainly true, except we still have 8 million people who are unemployed. I don't think that would suggest a real shortage yet. There may be some skill mix problems because we are going through a very important, I think, structural change. Many of the people who are unemployed are blue collar workers and much of the growth is in the service sector, which is generally white collar.

Senator PROXMIRE. At what point do you think the availability of workers, employment availability, may have an effect on prices? You say you don't think it's very significant.

Ms. NORWOOD. I think that one needs to look at that kind of situation. You can't look at it in the aggregate. We do have some labor markets where there is a shortage; we have some where there are surpluses of workers. In fact, there are many differences within the country. There always are.

Senator PROXMIRE. Can you tell us two or three major areas where a shortage is likely to have some pressure on wages and prices?

Ms. NORWOOD. I would not want to.

Senator PROXMIRE. In December 1980, 7.4 million persons were unemployed and 4.1 million received unemployment benefits. So 3.3 million unemployed didn't receive any benefits. In other words, 60 percent received benefits and 40 percent did not. In December 1983, the latest month for which data are available on all unemployment benefit programs, 9 million persons were unemployed of whom only 2.9 million persons received unemployment benefits. Thus there were 6.1 million of the unemployed who did not receive any benefits, nearly twice the 3.3 million in December 1980. That is a tremendous difference. Of course, it is a heartbreaking difference to people who are unemployed who don't get any unemployment benefits. What accounts for that large increase in the number of unemployed persons not receiving benefits?

Ms. NORWOOD. There has been a sharp dropoff in the proportion of the total unemployed, as measured in the current population survey, who are getting unemployment insurance benefits. The latest figure that I have, which is for the week of February 18, is that 36.9 percent of total unemployed are getting unemployment insurance benefits. It's very low. In 1975, for example, it was in the 60's.

Part of that, of course, is from the changes that have occurred in the unemployment insurance laws which have tightened eligibility. Part of that also is from more careful and tighter administration of the laws, and part of it is just unexplainable.

Senator PROXMIRE. Doesn't this tend to have a bad effect on the economy inasmuch as the people who are the most needy spend everything they have? I presume that these people go on welfare.

Ms. NORWOOD. Obviously those who are unemployed, without jobs, have to have income either from benefit programs or some other member of the family working. We had a sharp and steep relatively long recession, and as a result of that I think we probably are having now a somewhat larger number of people exhausting their benefits. On the other hand, we also have a much larger proportion of families in this country where there is more than one

earner, much larger than we have ever had before, so there is more of a family support system.

Senator PROXMIRE. In 1969, there were 55,000 persons unemployed for a year or more; in January of 1984, the latest month for which we have figures, there were 1.4 million jobless for a year or more, 25 times the number in 1969. What accounts for that huge increase of people who are unemployed for a year or more?

Ms. NORWOOD. I don't know.

Senator PROXMIRE. That is a spectacular difference.

Ms. NORWOOD. Part of it is the growth in labor force and population. We did during the 1970's create a very large number of jobs, but we have been through several recessions.

Senator PROXMIRE. Thank you.

Senator JEPSEN. I would like now to change direction. Do you have the economic indicators for February 1984?

Ms. NORWOOD. I don't have it before me, but I am familiar with it.

Senator JEPSEN. They have data on the output and the productivity of the nonfarm business sector for 1980 in this book. You believe them to be accurate, do you not?

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes, sir.

Senator JEPSEN. Productivity in 1980, the last year for the last administration, fell by five-tenths of 1 percent in the business sector and by seven-tenths of 1 percent in the nonfarm business sector. In 1983, however, productivity rose by 2.6 percent in the business sector and rose by 3.1 percentage points in the nonfarm business sector.

I'm not going to continue with all the figures. I can go on and on here. We're talking about productivity, and you can work it out. As I said, this economic recovery has been one of the best kept secrets in the country. The economy has been booming and we have been continuing on a broad sustainable basis to improve economically. We have had, even by the standards of the most severe of the critics, the most sustainable, solid economic recovery in history. But this being 1984, of course, we have learned all the reasons why, if you want to take and pull out the figures and twist them. But sticking with the facts, we find that there was a decline in productivity in the year 1980 and in 1983 productivity was dramatically improved. That's what the charts show.

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes. Of course, we had a recession in 1980 and we have a recovery now.

Senator JEPSEN. We had a recession in the last administration?

Ms. NORWOOD. From January to June 1980.

Senator JEPSEN. How many people are in the labor market today as compared to January 1981? Is it a decrease or an increase?

Ms. NORWOOD. It is larger, certainly. We now have a civilian labor force of 112,700,000.

Senator JEPSEN. What did we have January 1981?

Ms. NORWOOD. 108 million.

Senator JEPSEN. So we have nearly 5 million more?

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes. We have more people.

Senator JEPSEN. How many people did we have employed in 1981?

Ms. NORWOOD. One hundred million, and we now are at 104 million.

Senator JEPSEN. Any kind of involuntary unemployment is unfortunate, it's tragic, and long-term unemployment inevitably produces the most hardship. What kind of long-term unemployment have we seen in recent months?

Ms. NORWOOD. The very long-term unemployment, which is 6 months or longer, has been coming down as the recovery has continued.

Senator JEPSEN. The November 1983 issue of the Monthly Labor Review contains an article about the 1995 labor force, a second look. What changes in the age structure of the labor force are projected? What implications are seen for future productivity growth?

Ms. NORWOOD. We expect, of course, because of the changes in birth rate that we will have in the future a somewhat older labor force. Theoretically that should provide for a more mature work force, one which therefore would show improved productivity. On the other hand, members of minority groups are going to be a larger proportion of the labor force, and the minority population has a higher unemployment rate, has had a harder time in the labor force than the white population, and they may not have had the experience that some of the others have had.

Senator JEPSEN. Last month you reported that factory overtime hours were at their highest levels since 1979. This month they remain high?

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes.

Senator JEPSEN. There was a question earlier by my distinguished colleague about how long this was going to continue. Are there any projections, based on your experience and your record, that could be made with some degree of accuracy? Would you say that this recovery and the unemployment situation should improve longer than 8 months? How accurate is the 8-month prediction? What would you care to predict?

Ms. NORWOOD. I don't really know. I don't care to predict that. I can tell you that we had a longer recession than we usually have and we have had a longer recovery following that.

Senator JEPSEN. So 8 months hasn't any particular significance other than was the figure that was used in the question?

Ms. NORWOOD. We have already had 15 months of recovery.

Senator JEPSEN. Can we expect reasonably to have 16 months?

Ms. NORWOOD. I don't know; I really don't know. I leave that to the very, very large forecasting industry. That job I leave to them. We try to report on what has happened.

Senator PROXMIRE. You do a better job.

Senator JEPSEN. You do a better job. My colleague and I agree on that. The pollsters haven't been doing very well lately; their predictions are not too accurate, but they haven't been very accurate as far as this economy has been concerned all during the recovery, have they?

Ms. NORWOOD. I think the robustness of the employment part of the recovery is certainly more than what was expected.

Senator JEPSEN. And it has continued month after month after month, all the economic indicators going in the right direction, and more activity taking place.

You noted that women are now entering the work force at a slower rate than previously. Is it possible that some women no longer need to work as a result of labor market conditions improving?

Ms. NORWOOD. It's certainly possible. I am sure there are some women who are working because of family reverses during the recession who may have changed their work habits. Of course, most women work because they have to work: many women also work because many families in this country have become accustomed to two incomes and they are living, accordingly, to their expections, so are dependent upon two incomes.

Senator JEPSEN. I would like to explore just in the general area the relationship between the jobs in the private sector and the Government sector. The Government is one sector of our economy where I would prefer not to see an employment increase. Has there been any change in percent of the civilian labor being employed by Federal or State governments during the past year?

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes, sir. There has been a general decline. That is in part, of course, because there has been a cutback in Government activity. It is also in part, particularly in the State and local areas, because there are fewer youngsters. The largest proportion of local employment is in the school systems.

Senator JEPSEN. So there are fewer people working and being paid by tax dollars in relation to the number paying taxes and working in what we call real business jobs outside of Government activity. Is that an accurate statement?

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes.

Senator JEPSEN. If that's so, we're heading in the right direction.

Senator Proxmire.

Senator PROXMIRE. Let me ask Mr. Dalton a question. One concern I have, as I indicated earlier, is while our unemployment picture is encouraging, the price picture is not. Let me just review the reasons why I am concerned about this and get your reaction.

Food prices were up sharply last month. Fuel prices are likely to go up this month. Capacity utilization is 80 percent, which is higher than any time since 1979. Chairman Volcker, who testified before the Senate Banking Committee, indicated we may be entering an inflation danger zone because of the utilization capacity. The deficits are undermining international confidence in the dollar, a shock to the economy as import prices rise. Is it a fair statement, in your judgment, that inflation may surge substantially the remainder of the year?

I might just give you one more figure. When Beryl Sprinkel, the Under Secretary of Monetary Affairs of the Treasury, appeared before the Banking Committee he indicated that there is a 2-year lag between the increase in the money supply and price rises, and he showed that lag with a remarkable consistency over the last 20 years. Two years ago there was a sharp increase in the money supply, and he had predicted that in the next 6 months we are going to have inflationary push. For that reason, in addition to the ones I have here, what is your reaction?

Mr. DALTON. As you know, we don't make forecasts. The private sector forecasters indicate a rate of inflation of 5 percent.

Senator PROXMIRE. You don't forecast, but elements that I have listed here might suggest that 5 percent may be optimistic?

Mr. DALTON. I don't really know, but the really serious inflationary pressures we had, came from the energy surge, which seems to look reasonably good right now. Interest rates, of course, were a big factor, as well.

Senator PROXMIRE. But there could be a short-term increase and maybe longer term in fuel prices because of the severe March. We did have an awful mild January and February.

Mr. DALTON. I think we are seeking that or I think we saw that.

Senator PROXMIRE. Last month was pretty mild.

Mr. DALTON. In the price index for January we saw an increase in fuel.

Ms. NORWOOD. But the January increase in the Consumer Price Index is consistent with the possibility of the consensus forecast. There is nothing there to suggest yet that there is a real heating up beyond the 5 percent. Of course, we had 4.1 percent over the year.

Senator PROXMIRE. It has been a remarkable improvement, no question about it, I guess more spectacular than the recovery in employment, especially compared to what it was in 1979. My only question is, are we through with that? You indicate you can't predict.

Ms. NORWOOD. We do know that what brought the heating up of prices was energy, food, and housing. Those are the three areas where there has been a deceleration in prices.

Senator PROXMIRE. Well, that's an optimistic reaction. It seems to me that almost always, wages are more important than any of those elements. After all, that constitutes about 70 percent of the cost to American industry and it would greatly outweigh one factor, such as the availability of energy supplies.

Ms. NORWOOD. Certainly, wage change has an important effect. There appears to be still some deceleration in inflation and wages.

Senator PROXMIRE. I have one other question. You indicate in your oral testimony, "The performance in the manufacturing sector during the recovery has been quite uneven," with strong employment growth in some industries. Does this indicate inflationary labor market pressures or production bottlenecks may arise in these industries? What is the cause of this imbalance? Is it the budget deficits and, in turn, our export industry, which indeed is an element? First, does this indicate that inflationary labor market pressures and production bottlenecks may arise in some of these industries?

Ms. NORWOOD. I am not sure that there is a direct relationship. What seems to be going on in some of the manufacturing industries is that there has been a recovery from the recession. Automobiles, for example. The motor vehicle and equipment industry has regained more than the jobs that it lost; the electrical and electronics equipment industry has; lumber and wood products has. And yet there are others that are very important durable manufacturing industries which have regained very little.

Senator PROXMIRE. That's exactly the kind of situation where you would get price pressures, I'd presume, such as automobiles. If

you have a boom recovery, you might get price increases, right? Isn't that logical?

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes, and there are, of course, many other factors that affect that. The cost of automobiles is also affected. I think there are a lot of factors which go into that. But what is happening is a very large increase in the service-producing sector and a lesser change in the goods-producing sector. We lost 2 million jobs in the recession in manufacturing, and we've regained roughly half of them, about 1 million; we lost only 100,000 jobs in the service-producing sector during the recession, and we have gained more than 1.5 million since the trough.

Senator PROXMIRE. What concerns many economists, and many others, including the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, is the unevenness in our economy, the fact that you have some interest-sensitive industries which suffer as interest rates remain high in very real terms and are likely to get higher as these deficits continue.

Ms. NORWOOD. The housing industry, therefore lumber and wood manufacturing, appliance manufacturing, furniture manufacturing are affected.

Senator PROXMIRE. A shift out of these industries into service industries, it seems to me, might have some reverse effect on prices.

Thank you very much, Ms. Norwood.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator JEPSEN. Well, I thank you, Ms. Norwood, for coming here today and reinforcing the fact that President Reagan's commitment and resolve to bring freedom and opportunity back to the American people is working. His policies are working. We still have a long way to go. We have problems. But people are—across the board pretty much—joining hands and working together to solve these things under his leadership rather than trying to point a finger. As a result we're having a national renewal economically, spiritually, politically, and I am pleased to see one of the keystones in this national renewal and this economic recovery, that is, unemployment, dropping again.

We look forward to the next month's report. Every time we think, well, you can't do better than last month. But this month was markedly better than last month. I hope next month will show the same continued progress and direction.

I thank you.

Senator PROXMIRE. If the chairman would yield, I would just like to say that if President Reagan's policies can accomplish this, just think what President Carter's policies would have accomplished.

Senator JEPSEN. The committee stands adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 10:35 a.m., the committee adjourned, subject to the call of the Chair.]

EMPLOYMENT-UNEMPLOYMENT

FRIDAY, APRIL 6, 1984

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE,
Washington, DC.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD-106, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. Daniel E. Lungren (member of the committee) presiding.

Present: Representative Lungren and Senator Proxmire.

Also present: Deborah Clay-Mendez, Christopher J. Frenze, and Paul B. Manchester, professional staff members.

OPENING STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE LUNGREN, PRESIDING

Representative LUNGREN. Madam Commissioner, welcome again to the monthly hearing on the unemployment and employment situation.

Last August you appeared before this committee to report an unprecedented level of civilian employment. Each month since then you have returned to announce yet a new employment record.

According to the household survey 250,000 new jobs were created in March. Over the 16-month course of this recovery, vigorous economic growth has created more than 5 million new jobs for Americans.

Referring to your testimony last month, this amounts to the best economic recovery American workers have seen since World War II. Moreover, these employment gains have been shared by men, women, whites, and blacks.

The news you bring today indicates that the duration, breadth, and vigor of the employment gains during the recovery continue on a strong path.

We are all aware of the hardships that unemployment can bring. To date, the civilian unemployment rate has fallen by 2.9 percentage points in the course of this robust recovery. In March, the unemployment rate for adult men continued to decline, falling by two-tenths of 1 percentage point. Although the overall civilian unemployment rate held steady, the strong February rise in the index of leading economic indicators points the way to still further declines in unemployment in the months ahead.

The Commerce Department estimates that real GNP increased by an astounding 7.2 percent during the first quarter of 1984. I'm not sure anybody would have predicted that beforehand. Certainly the administration did not nor those of us in the Congress. The strong pace of this recovery is fostered by the productive capabili-

36-618 O 84 - 7

ties of American workers and private industry. More Americans are working now than ever before in our Nation's history, and it has not required a costly Government jobs program to get them there.

Americans are working and, equally important, they are no longer suffering from the devastating effects of uncontrolled inflation. According to the most recent data available, the Consumer Price Index increased only four-tenths of 1 percent in February.

While those of us in the Congress should be concerned about the budget deficits and their impact on inflation in the long term as well as the short term, hopefully Congress will screw up enough intestinal fortitude to do something about that in the next few months.

As we enter the second quarter of 1984, it appears that it will indeed be a banner year for productivity, employment, and economic growth.

Ms. Norwood, before we proceed with your testimony, let me offer you my congratulations. I understand that in recognition of your distinguished record you have been selected by your fellow public administrators to receive a national public service award in 1984. Congratulations. I'm sure those of us, both Democrats and Republicans, on this committee who have had the opportunity to observe your work over the past number of years agree with the selection committee for that award.

Senator Proxmire.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR PROXMIRE

Senator PROXMIRE. Thank you, Congressman.

Well, I'd like to join in congratulating Ms. Norwood. I think she's done a marvelous job as Commissioner and she's a highly, highly competent person and although we try often to make her make statements that are favorable to the Republicans or the Democrats or subjective, she does a great job of weaving and bobbing and evading and not giving us any partisan satisfaction while giving us all the facts.

I'd just like to point out very briefly that the news this morning I don't think has been as good as it's been in the past. In fact, for the first time in a number of months, there's been no improvement in unemployment overall. It's the same as it was in February and it's still at a very high rate, 7.7 percent with more than 9 million people still out of work—no, it's not quite that high—it's 8,772,000, but that's still a very high level by historical standards. And while we had an improvement in adult men, no improvement for adult women, a big increase—it looks big to me—for teenagers. Their unemployment rate went from 19.3 to 19.9 percent. And while there was no increase in unemployment for whites, there was a significant increase for blacks. It went from 16.2 to 16.6 percent and a 10.2- to 11.3-percent increase for Hispanics, which is above their level of unemployment not only in February but also in January.

There's another element here that concerns me and that is that we had a fall in the number of hours worked in March compared to February, seasonally adjusted. It went down from 35.4 hours to 35.2 hours. And that's lower than it was in January and lower than it

was, as a matter of fact, in the fourth quarter of 1983, as well as in the other months of 1984.

Also, manufacturing overtime is down and a significant drop in hours worked not only overall total private but also in manufacturing.

So it suggests that while we can't say that the recovery is not still underway—I'm sure it is and all the indicators suggest it is—I think it's hard to see in this strictly employment situation that it's an exuberant continuation, particularly in view of the fact that we still have as many as 8,700,000 people out of work.

Thank you, Congressman.

Representative LUNGREN. Thank you.

Madam Commissioner, welcome, and please proceed as you wish.

STATEMENT OF HON. JANET L. NORWOOD, COMMISSIONER, BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, ACCOMPANIED BY THOMAS J. PLEWES, ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER, OFFICE OF EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT STATISTICS; AND KENNETH V. DALTON, ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER, OFFICE OF PRICES AND LIVING CONDITIONS

Ms. NORWOOD. Thank you very much, Congressman. I'd like to introduce, as usual, Mr. Plewes on my left who is our Associate Commissioner for Employment and Unemployment Analysis; and Mr. Dalton on my right, who is our Associate Commissioner for Prices and Living Conditions.

We are always very pleased to be here to offer a few comments to supplement our release.

There were continued signs of improvement in the labor market in March. Employment rose, and both the overall and the civilian unemployment rates held steady at 7.7 and 7.8 percent, respectively. The labor market has improved markedly during the present recovery, as very large job gains were registered in both the labor force and the business surveys. Employment growth continued in March, although job gains were less brisk than in previous months.

The number of nonagricultural payroll jobs, as measured by the business survey, advanced by 145,000. The bulk of the gain occurred in the services industry, with both business and health services registering strong increases. The services industry had added jobs even during the recession and has grown sharply—by 1.2 million—during the recovery period.

The number of manufacturing jobs also increased in March, but less than in recent months. The largest manufacturing gains took place in electrical equipment and machinery. Since November 1982, manufacturing jobs have increased by 1.3 million, accounting for 62 percent of the jobs lost during the recession.

March employment gains took place in nearly two-thirds of the industries comprising the BLS diffusion index. This indicates that the employment gains, though smaller than those of recent months, were nevertheless quite widespread. This diffusion throughout the economy is, I believe, an additional sign of continued strength in the labor market.

In construction, employment rose less in March than seasonally expected and, after seasonal adjustment, returned to the January

level. Bad weather may have postponed the normal spring expansion in this industry. Bad weather also may have contributed to the decline in the March workweek.

In manufacturing, weekly hours also declined, but this decline was from unusually high levels in the preceding 2 months. Factory hours usually increase in March. This year, however, between December and March, substantial job gains occurred. These employment gains may have substituted for part of the expected hours increase in March. The index of aggregate weekly hours which combines the effect of these two factors was 1.7 percent above the December 1983 level.

Unemployment held steady in March. The overall rate, which includes the Armed Forces in the labor force, was 7.7 percent, and the civilian worker rate was 7.8 percent. Both remained 2.9 percentage points below their recession highs.

Unemployment among adult men continued to trend downward, dropping two-tenths of 1 percentage point in March. The improvement was confined to white men, however, as the rate for black men rose in March. Despite considerable improvement over the recovery period, unemployment rates among both black and white men are still above their prerecession levels. In contrast, though little changed in March, jobless rates for women were virtually back to their prerecession levels, both among blacks and whites. The unemployment rate for Hispanic workers is down considerably from its recession high but remains somewhat above prerecession levels.

There was a decline in the number of persons working part time for economic reasons in nonagricultural industries. In March, that count dropped by nearly 350,000 to 5.5 million. At the recession high, there had been 6.7 million persons working part time involuntarily.

The proportion of the civilian working-age population with jobs was 59.2 percent in March. Fifty percent of adult women are employed, 73 percent of adult men, and 43 percent of all teenagers. Since their recession lows, these employment-population ratios have risen 1½ points for adult women, 2½ points for adult men, and 3 points for teenagers.

The number of adult women in the labor force increased by 200,000 in March. Over the course of the recovery, the overall labor force has grown by nearly 2 million, with adult women accounting for 1.4 million of the increase; the adult male labor force has grown by 1 million and the teenage labor force has declined by nearly 400,000.

The number of discouraged workers continued to decline. At 1.3 million in the first quarter of 1984, the number of persons who report that they would like to work but are not seeking jobs because they believe that they would not be able to find a job has dropped by nearly 500,000 since the fourth quarter of 1982.

In summary, the March labor market statistics indicate continued strength in the economy. While the magnitude of the over-the-month improvements was not as great as in some recent months, employment growth was widespread. Unemployment continued to decline among adult men, and there was a reduction in the number of persons working part time for economic reasons.

We'd be very happy to try to answer any questions you may have.

[The table attached to Ms. Norwood's statement, together with the Employment Situation press release referred to, follows:]

UNEMPLOYMENT RATES OF ALL CIVILIAN WORKERS BY ALTERNATIVE SEASONAL ADJUSTMENT METHODS

Month and year	Unadjusted rate	X-11 ARIMA method					X-11 method (official method before 1980)	Range (cols. 2-7)
		Official procedure	Concurrent	Stable	Total	Residual		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
1983								
March	10.8	10.3	10.3	10.2	10.4	10.4	10.3	0.2
April	10.0	10.2	10.2	10.2	10.3	10.2	10.3	.1
May	9.8	10.1	10.1	10.2	10.1	10.1	10.1	.1
June	10.2	10.0	10.0	10.0	9.8	10.0	10.0	.2
July	9.4	9.5	9.5	9.4	9.5	9.5	9.5	.1
August	9.2	9.5	9.5	9.4	9.5	9.5	9.5	.1
September	8.8	9.2	9.2	9.2	9.2	9.1	9.3	.2
October	8.4	8.8	8.8	9.0	8.8	8.8	8.9	.2
November	8.1	8.4	8.4	8.5	8.4	8.4	8.4	.1
December	8.0	8.2	8.2	8.4	8.2	8.2	8.2	.2
1984								
January	8.8	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.1	8.0	8.0	.1
February	8.4	7.8	7.8	7.6	7.8	7.7	7.8	.2
March	8.1	7.8	7.8	7.7	7.8	7.6	7.7	.2

EXPLANATION OF COLUMN HEADS

(1) Unadjusted rate. Unemployment rate for all civilian workers, not seasonally adjusted.

(2) Official procedure (X-11 ARIMA method). The published seasonally adjusted rate for all civilian workers. Each of the 3 major civilian labor force components—agricultural employment, nonagricultural employment and unemployment—for 4 age-sex groups—males and females, ages 16-19 and 20 years and over—are seasonally adjusted independently using data from January 1974 forward. The data series for each of these 12 components are extended by a year at each end of the original series using ARIMA (Auto-Regressive, Integrated, Moving Average) models chosen specifically for each series. Each extended series is then seasonally adjusted with the X-11 portion of the X-11 ARIMA program. The 4 teenage unemployment and nonagricultural employment components are adjusted with the additive adjustment model, while the other components are adjusted with the multiplicative model. The unemployment rate is computed by summing the 4 seasonally adjusted unemployment components and calculating that total as a percent of the civilian labor force total derived by summing all 12 seasonally adjusted components. All the seasonally adjusted series are revised at the end of each year. Extrapolated factors for January-June are computed at the beginning of each year; extrapolated factors for July-December are computed in the middle of the year after the June data become available. Each set of 6-month factors are published in advance, in the January and July issues, respectively, of Employment and Earnings.

(3) Concurrent (X-11 ARIMA method). The official procedure for computation of the rate for all civilian workers using the 12 components is followed except that extrapolated factors are not used at all. Each component is seasonally adjusted with the X-11 ARIMA program each month as the most recent data become available. Rates for each month of the current year are shown as first computed; they are revised only once each year, at the end of the year when data for the full year become available. For example, the rate for January 1984 would be based, during 1984, on the adjustment of data from the period January 1974 through January 1984.

(4) Stable (X-11 ARIMA method). Each of the 12 civilian labor force components is extended using ARIMA models as in the official procedure and then run through the X-11 part of the program using the stable option. This option assumes that seasonal patterns are basically constant from year-to-year and computes final seasonal factors as unweighted averages of all the seasonal-irregular components for each month across the entire span of the period adjusted. As in the official procedure, factors are extrapolated in 6-month intervals and the series are revised at the end of each year. The procedure for computation of the rate from the seasonally adjusted components is also identical to the official procedure.

(5) Total (X-11 ARIMA method). This is one alternative aggregation procedure, in which total unemployment and civilian labor force levels are extended with ARIMA models and directly adjusted with multiplicative adjustment models in the X-11 part of the program. The rate is computed by taking seasonally adjusted total unemployment as a percent of seasonally adjusted total civilian labor force. Factors are extrapolated in 6-month intervals and the series revised at the end of each year.

(6) Residual (X-11 ARIMA method). This is another alternative aggregation method, in which total civilian employment and civilian labor force levels are extended using ARIMA models and then directly adjusted with multiplicative adjustment models. The seasonally adjusted unemployment level is derived by subtracting seasonally adjusted employment from seasonally adjusted labor force. The rate is then computed by taking the derived unemployment level as a percent of the labor force level. Factors are extrapolated in 6-month intervals and the series revised at the end of each year.

(7) X-11 method (official method before 1980). The method for computation of the official procedure is used except that the series are not extended with ARIMA models and the factors are projected in 12-month intervals. The standard X-11 program is used to perform the seasonal adjustment.

Methods of Adjustment: The X-11 ARIMA method was developed at Statistics Canada by the Seasonal Adjustment and Times Series Staff under the direction of Estela Bee Dagum. The method is described in "The X-11 ARIMA Seasonal Adjustment Method," by Estela Bee Dagum, Statistics Canada Catalogue No. 12-564E, February 1980.

The standard X-11 method is described in "X-11 Variant of the Census Method II Seasonal Adjustment Program," by Julius Shiskin, Allan Young and John Musgrave (Technical Paper No. 15, Bureau of the Census, 1967).

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, April 1984.

News

U.S. Department of Labor
Bureau of Labor Statistics
Washington, D.C. 20212

Technical information: (202) 523-1944
523-1371
523-1959
Media contact: 523-1913

USDL 84-145
TRANSMISSION OF MATERIAL IN THIS RELEASE IS EMBARGOED UNTIL 8:30 A.M. (EST), FRIDAY, APRIL 6, 1984

THE EMPLOYMENT SITUATION: MARCH 1984

Employment continued to rise in March and unemployment was unchanged, the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U.S. Department of Labor reported today. Both the overall unemployment rate, 7.7 percent, and the civilian worker rate, 7.8 percent, remained at February levels; each continued to be nearly 3 percentage points below its 1982 recession high.

Total civilian employment--as measured by the monthly survey of households--rose by 250,000 in March to 104.1 million, seasonally adjusted, following a 700,000 gain in February. Civilian employment has increased by 5.1 million since the November 1982 recession trough.

The number of employees on nonagricultural payrolls--as measured by the monthly survey of establishments--was up by 145,000 to 92.5 million, seasonally adjusted. The March job gain was smaller than in recent months, but employment in services and durable goods manufacturing continued to advance.

Unemployment (Household Survey Data)

The civilian worker unemployment rate was unchanged in March at 7.8 percent, seasonally adjusted, but remained well below the late 1982 recession high of 10.7 percent. The number of unemployed persons held steady from February to March at 8.8 million, 3.1 million below the November 1982 level. Despite the overall stability for March, the unemployment rate for adult men continued to edge down and, at 6.8 percent, was substantially below the recession high of 10.0 percent. Jobless rates for adult women and teenagers (6.9 and 19.9 percent, respectively) have shown little change over the last 4 months. The unemployment rate for white workers was unchanged over the month, and the rate for black workers was little changed, despite an increase among black men, a group that had been showing marked improvement in prior months. The Hispanic jobless rate rose to 11.3 percent, returning to the January level. (See tables A-2 and A-3.)

The number of unemployed persons who had lost their last job continued to decline; job losers accounted for 53 percent of total unemployment in March, compared with 62 percent in November 1982. This over-the-month decrease was offset by increased unemployment among persons seeking their first job. Both measures of average duration of unemployment--the mean and the median--were unchanged in March after dropping sharply in the prior month. (See tables A-7 and A-8.)

The number of persons working part time involuntarily--sometimes referred to as the partially unemployed--declined by about 350,000 in March to 5.5 million and was 1.2 million below the peak level reached in January 1983. (See table A-4.)

Civilian Employment and the Labor Force (Household Survey Data)

Total civilian employment grew by 250,000 in March, after a sharper advance in February. At 104.1 million, seasonally adjusted, March employment was 5.1 million above the recession trough. During the 16-month recovery period, employment has increased by 2.9 million for adult men and 2.2 million for adult women, while teenage employment was unchanged.

The civilian labor force rose slightly over the month to 112.9 million, seasonally adjusted. Since March 1983, the labor force has increased by about 2.0 million, as substantial gains among adult workers--900,000 men and 1.2 million women--overshadowed a small decline for teenagers. (See table A-2.)

BLS
Centennial
of Labor
Statistics

Discouraged Workers (Household Survey Data)

The number of people wanting jobs but not looking for work because they believed they could not find any--1.3 million in the first quarter--continued the downward progression that has totaled nearly 500,000 since the fourth quarter 1982 recessionary high. Virtually all of this drop was among persons who reported that they were not seeking work because of job-market factors--as opposed to personal factors such as age and lack of education or training. Women and blacks continued to be disproportionately represented among the discouraged--64 and 30 percent, respectively. (See table A-13.)

Industry Payroll Employment (Establishment Survey Data)

Nonagricultural payroll employment rose by 145,000 in March, somewhat off the pace of recent months. While job gains were widespread--nearly two-thirds of the 186 industries in the BLS index of diffusion registered over-the-month increases--they tended to be small. At 92.5

Table A. Major indicators of labor market activity, seasonally adjusted

Category	Quarterly averages			Monthly data			Feb.-Mar. change
	1983		1984	1984			
	I	IV	I	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	
HOUSEHOLD DATA							
	Thousands of persons						
Labor force 1/	112,365	113,702	114,292	113,901	114,377	114,598	221
Total employment 1/	100,879	104,195	105,426	104,876	105,576	105,826	250
Civilian labor force	110,700	112,012	112,607	112,215	112,693	112,912	219
Civilian employment	99,214	102,506	103,740	103,190	103,892	104,140	248
Unemployment	11,486	9,507	8,866	9,026	8,801	8,772	-29
Not in labor force	62,805	62,938	63,072	63,318	62,986	62,912	-74
Discouraged workers	1,765	1,457	1,339	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
	Percent of labor force						
Unemployment rates:							
All workers 1/	10.2	8.4	7.8	7.9	7.7	7.7	0
All civilian workers	10.4	8.5	7.9	8.0	7.8	7.8	0
Adult men	9.7	7.8	7.0	7.3	7.0	6.8	-0.2
Adult women	8.9	7.2	7.0	7.1	6.9	6.9	0
Teenagers	23.1	20.6	19.6	19.4	19.3	19.9	0.6
White	9.1	7.4	6.8	6.9	6.7	6.7	0
Black	20.2	17.9	16.5	16.7	16.2	16.6	0.4
Hispanic origin	15.6	12.1	10.9	11.2	10.2	11.3	1.1
ESTABLISHMENT DATA							
	Thousands of jobs						
Nonfarm payroll employment	88,815	91,346	92,256p	91,930	92,347p	92,490p	141p
Goods-producing industries	23,088	24,298	24,724p	24,617	24,772p	24,782p	10p
Service-producing industries	65,727	67,048	67,532p	67,313	67,575p	67,708p	133p
	Hours of work						
Average weekly hours:							
Total private nonfarm	34.8	35.3	35.4p	35.5	35.6p	35.2p	-0.2p
Manufacturing	39.5	40.6	40.8p	41.0	41.0p	40.5p	-0.5p
Manufacturing overtime	2.5	3.3	3.5p	3.5	3.6p	3.4p	-0.2p

1/ Includes the resident Armed Forces.
p=preliminary.
N.A.=not available.

million, seasonally adjusted, payroll employment has grown by 3.7 million since November 1982. (See tables B-1 and B-6.)

Most of the over-the-month rise occurred in the services industry, where employment rose by 125,000. Little or no change occurred elsewhere in the service-producing sector, except for a small increase in wholesale trade. There was little change in the goods-producing sector, as a modest employment increase of 60,000 in manufacturing was offset by a 50,000 drop in construction. The increase in factory jobs occurred primarily in the durable goods industries, particularly machinery, fabricated metals, and electrical and electronic equipment. Total manufacturing employment has now recovered a little over three-fifths of the jobs lost during the recent recession.

Weekly Hours (Establishment Survey Data)

Average weekly hours for production or nonsupervisory workers on private nonagricultural industries fell 0.2 hour in March to 35.2 hours, seasonally adjusted. Declines were widespread, as all major industry divisions except services experienced shorter workweeks.

The manufacturing workweek decreased by half an hour from the very high levels recorded in January and February. At 40.5 hours, factory hours have returned to the level prevailing at the end of last year. The decline in hours was pervasive within both durable and nondurable goods industries; only automobiles and petroleum and coal products posted increases. (See table B-2.)

The index of aggregate weekly hours of production or nonsupervisory workers on private nonagricultural payrolls dropped 0.5 percent to 109.8 (1977=100) in March. Declines were widespread, but particularly large in construction, which fell by 5.7 percent. This sharp drop refected a decrease in weekly hours that can be associated with severe weather in many parts of the country as well as the decline in construction employment. The manufacturing index declined by 0.8 percent over the month to 95.6 but was still nearly 15 percent above the November 1982 level. (See table B-5.)

Hourly and Weekly Earnings (Establishment Survey Data)

Average hourly earnings edged up in March, but average weekly earnings fell 0.3 percent on a seasonally adjusted basis as a result of the decline in the workweek. Before allowance for seasonality, average hourly earnings were unchanged at $8.24, and weekly earnings decreased slightly to $288.40. Over the year, these levels represent increases of 34 cents and $14.27, respectively. (See table B-3.)

The Hourly Earnings Index (Establishment Survey Data)

The Hourly Earnings Index (HEI) was 158.7 (1977=100) in March, seasonally adjusted, an increase of 0.3 percent from February. For the 12 months ended in March, the increase (before seasonal adjustment) was 3.4 percent. The HEI excludes the offects of two types of changes unrelated to underlying wage rate movements--fluctuations in overtime in manufacturing and interindustry employment shifts. In dollars of constant purchasing power, the HEI decreased 0.6 percent during the 12-month period ended in February. (See table B-4.)

HOUSEHOLD DATA

Table A-1. Employment status of the population, including Armed Forces in the United States, by sex

(Numbers in thousands)

Employment status and sex	Not seasonally adjusted			Seasonally adjusted[1]					
	Mar. 1983	Feb. 1984	Mar. 1984	Mar. 1983	Nov. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984	Feb. 1984	Mar. 1984
TOTAL									
Noninstitutional population[2]	175,320	177,363	177,510	175,320	176,636	176,809	177,219	177,361	177,510
Labor force[3]	111,537	113,052	113,514	112,394	113,720	113,828	113,901	114,177	114,594
Participation rate[4]	63.6	63.7	63.9	64.1	64.4	64.4	64.3	64.5	64.6
Total employed[3]	99,638	103,645	104,456	100,980	104,291	104,629	104,876	105,576	105,826
Employment-population ratio[5]	56.8	58.4	58.8	57.6	59.0	59.2	59.2	59.5	59.6
Resident Armed Forces	1,664	1,684	1,686	1,664	1,695	1,684	1,686	1,686	1,686
Civilian employed	97,994	101,961	102,770	99,316	102,606	102,941	103,190	103,890	104,140
Agriculture	2,971	2,857	2,872	3,386	3,247	3,356	3,271	3,395	3,481
Nonagricultural industries	95,023	99,104	99,898	95,930	99,359	99,585	99,918	100,496	100,659
Unemployed	11,899	9,407	9,057	11,419	9,429	9,195	9,026	8,601	8,772
Unemployment rate[6]	10.7	8.3	8.0	10.2	8.3	8.1	7.9	7.7	7.7
Not in labor force	63,788	64,311	63,996	62,921	62,916	62,985	63,318	62,984	62,916
Men, 16 years and over									
Noninstitutional population[2]	83,789	84,811	84,840	83,749	84,423	84,506	84,765	84,411	84,440
Labor force[3]	63,645	64,203	64,468	64,096	64,866	64,838	64,930	65,091	65,136
Participation rate[4]	76.0	75.7	76.0	76.5	76.8	76.7	76.6	76.1	76.4
Total employed[3]	56,347	58,629	59,161	57,423	59,389	59,560	59,781	60,147	60,283
Employment-population ratio[5]	67.2	69.1	69.7	68.5	70.3	70.5	70.5	70.4	71.0
Resident Armed Forces	1,528	1,540	1,542	1,528	1,534	1,537	1,542	1,540	1,542
Civilian employed	54,819	57,089	57,622	55,895	57,855	58,043	58,239	58,607	58,741
Unemployed	7,298	5,574	5,306	6,673	5,457	5,278	5,149	4,944	4,857
Unemployment rate[6]	11.5	8.7	8.2	10.4	8.4	8.1	7.9	7.6	7.5
Women, 16 years and over									
Noninstitutional population[2]	91,532	92,552	92,630	91,532	92,214	92,302	92,454	92,554	92,610
Labor force[3]	47,891	48,849	49,045	48,301	48,854	48,966	47,971	49,241	49,442
Participation rate[4]	52.3	52.8	52.9	52.9	53.0	53.1	53.0	53.2	53.4
Total employed[3]	43,311	45,016	45,292	43,557	44,902	45,069	45,094	45,429	45,536
Employment-population ratio[5]	47.3	48.6	48.9	47.6	48.7	48.8	48.8	49.1	49.2
Resident Armed Forces	136	144	144	136	151	151	144	146	144
Civilian employed	43,175	44,872	45,148	43,421	44,751	44,918	44,950	45,283	45,392
Unemployed	4,581	3,833	3,753	4,744	3,972	3,917	3,876	3,855	3,905
Unemployment rate[6]	9.6	7.8	7.7	9.8	8.1	8.0	7.9	7.8	7.9

[1] The population and Armed Forces figures are not adjusted for seasonal variation; therefore, identical numbers appear in the unadjusted and seasonally adjusted columns.

[2] Includes members of the Armed Forces stationed in the United States.

[3] Labor force as a percent of the noninstitutional population.

[4] Total employment as a percent of the noninstitutional population.

[5] Unemployment as a percent of the labor force (including the resident Armed Forces).

Explanatory Note

This news release presents statistics from two major surveys, the Current Population Survey (household survey) and the Current Employment Statistics Survey (establishment survey). The household survey provides the information on the labor force, total employment, and unemployment that appears in the A tables, marked HOUSEHOLD DATA. It is a sample survey of about 60,000 households that is conducted by the Bureau of the Census with most of the findings analyzed and published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS).

The establishment survey provides the information on the employment, hours, and earnings of workers on nonagricultural payrolls that appears in the B tables, marked ESTABLISHMENT DATA. This information is collected from payroll records by BLS in cooperation with State agencies. The sample includes approximately 189,000 establishments employing about 36 million people.

For both surveys, the data for a given month are actually collected for and relate to a particular week. In the household survey, unless otherwise indicated, it is the calendar week that contains the 12th day of the month, which is called the survey week. In the establishment survey, the reference week is the pay period including the 12th, which may or may not correspond directly to the calendar week.

The data in this release are affected by a number of technical factors, including definitions, survey differences, seasonal adjustments, and the inevitable variance in results between a survey of a sample and a census of the entire population. Each of these factors is explained below.

Coverage, definitions and differences between surveys

The sample households in the household survey are selected so as to reflect the entire civilian noninstitutional population 16 years of age and older. Each person in a household is classified as employed, unemployed, or not in the labor force. Those who hold more than one job are classified according to the job at which they worked the most hours.

People are classified as *employed* if they did any work at all as paid civilians; worked in their own business or profession or on their own farm; or worked 15 hours or more in an enterprise operated by a member of their family, whether they were paid or not. People are also counted as employed if they were on unpaid leave because of illness, bad weather, disputes between labor and management, or personal reasons. Members of the Armed Forces stationed in the United States are also included in the employed total.

People are classified as *unemployed*, regardless of their eligibility for unemployment benefits or public assistance, if they meet all of the following criteria: They had no employment during the survey week; they were available for work at that time; and they made specific efforts to find employment sometime during the prior 4 weeks. Also included among the unemployed are persons not looking for work because they were laid off and waiting to be recalled and those expecting to report to a job within 30 days.

The *labor force* equals the sum of the number employed and the number unemployed. The *unemployment rate* is the percentage of unemployed people in the labor force (civilian plus the resident Armed Forces). Table A-5 presents a special grouping of seven measures of unemployment based on varying definitions of unemployment and the labor force. The definitions are provided in the table. The most restrictive definition yields U-1, and the most comprehensive yields U-7. The overall unemployment rate is U-5a, while U-5b represents the same measure with a civilian labor force base.

Unlike the household survey, the establishment survey only counts wage and salary employees whose names appear on the payroll records of nonagricultural firms. As a result, there are many differences between the two surveys, among which are the following:

-----The household survey, although based on a smaller sample, reflects a larger segment of the population; the establishment survey excludes agriculture, the self-employed, unpaid family workers, private household workers, and members of the resident Armed Forces;

-----The household survey includes people on unpaid leave among the employed; the establishment survey does not;

-----The household survey is limited to those 16 years of age and older; the establishment survey is not limited by age;

-----The household survey has no duplication of individuals, because each individual is counted only once; in the establishment survey, employees working at more than one job or otherwise appearing on more than one payroll would be counted separately for each appearance.

Other differences between the two surveys are described in "Comparing Employment Estimates from Household and Payroll Surveys," which may be obtained from the BLS upon request.

Seasonal adjustment

Over a course of a year, the size of the Nation's labor force and the levels of employment and unemployment undergo sharp fluctuations due to such seasonal events as changes in weather, reduced or expanded production, harvests, major holidays, and the opening and closing of schools. For example, the labor force increases by a large number each June, when schools close and many young people enter the job market. The effect of such seasonal variation can be very large; over the course of a year, for example, seasonality may account for as much as 95 percent of the month-to-month changes in unemployment.

Because these seasonal events follow a more or less regular pattern each year, their influence on statistical trends can be eliminated by adjusting the statistics from month to month. These adjustments make nonseasonal developments, such as declines in economic activity or increases in the participation of women in the labor force, easier to spot. To return to the school's-out example, the large number of people entering the labor force each June is likely to obscure any other changes that have taken place since May, making it difficult to determine if the level of economic activity has risen or declined. However, because the effect of students finishing school in previous years is known, the statistics for the current year can be adjusted to allow for a comparable change. Insofar as the seasonal adjustment is made correctly, the adjusted figure provides a more useful tool with which to analyze changes in economic activity.

Measures of labor force, employment, and unemployment contain components such as age and sex. Statistics for all

employees, production workers, average weekly hours, and average hourly earnings include components based on the employer's industry. All these statistics can be seasonally adjusted either by adjusting the total or by adjusting each of the components and combining them. The second procedure usually yields more accurate information and is therefore followed by BLS. For example, the seasonally adjusted figure for the labor force is the sum of eight seasonally adjusted civilian employment components, plus the resident Armed Forces total (not adjusted for seasonality), and four seasonally adjusted unemployment components; the total for unemployment is the sum of the four unemployment components; and the overall unemployment rate is derived by dividing the resulting estimate of total unemployment by the estimate of the labor force.

The numerical factors used to make the seasonal adjustments are recalculated regularly. For the household survey, the factors are calculated for the January-June period and again for the July-December period. The January revision is applied to data that have been published over the previous 5 years. For the establishment survey, updated factors for seasonal adjustment are calculated only once a year, along with the introduction of new benchmarks which are discussed at the end of the next section.

Sampling variability

Statistics based on the household and establishment surveys are subject to sampling error, that is, the estimate of the number of people employed and the other estimates drawn from these surveys probably differ from the figures that would be obtained from a complete census, even if the same questionnaires and procedures were used. In the household survey, the amount of the differences can be expressed in terms of standard errors. The numerical value of a standard error depends upon the size of the sample, the results of the survey, and other factors. However, the numerical value is always such that the chances are 68 out of 100 that an estimate based on the sample will differ by no more than the standard error from the results of a complete census. The chances are 90 out of 100 that an estimate based on the sample will differ by no more than 1.6 times the standard error from the results of a complete census. At the 90-percent level of confidence--the confidence limits used by BLS in its analyses--the error for the monthly change in total employment is on the order of plus or minus 328,000; for total unemployment it is 220,000; and, for the overall unemployment rate, it is 0.19 percentage point. These figures do not mean that the sample results are off by these magnitudes but, rather, that the chances are 90 out of 100 that the "true" level or rate would not be expected to differ from the estimates by more than these amounts.

Sampling errors for monthly surveys are reduced when the data are cumulated for several months, such as quarterly or annually. Also, as a general rule, the smaller the estimate, the larger the sampling error. Therefore, relatively speaking, the estimate of the size of the labor force is subject to less error than is the estimate of the number unemployed. And, among the unemployed, the sampling error for the jobless rate of adult men, for example, is much smaller than is the error for the jobless rate of teenagers. Specifically, the error on monthly change in the jobless rate for men is .26 percentage point; for teenagers, it is 1.25 percentage points.

In the establishment survey, estimates for the 2 most current months are based on incomplete returns; for this reason, these estimates are labeled preliminary in the tables. When all the returns in the sample have been received, the estimates are revised. In other words, data for the month of September are published in preliminary form in October and November and in final form in December. To remove errors that build up over time, a comprehensive count of the employed is conducted each year. The results of this survey are used to establish new benchmarks—comprehensive counts of employment—against which month-to-month changes can be measured. The new benchmarks also incorporate changes in the classification of industries and allow for the formation of new establishments.

Additional statistics and other information

In order to provide a broad view of the Nation's employment situation, BLS regularly publishes a wide variety of data in this news release. More comprehensive statistics are contained in *Employment and Earnings*, published each month by BLS. It is available for $6.00 per issue or $39.00 per year from the U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20204. A check or money order made out to the Superintendent of Documents must accompany all orders.

Employment and Earnings also provides approximations of the standard errors for the household survey data published in this release. For unemployment and other labor force categories, the standard errors appear in tables B through J of its "Explanatory Notes." Measures of the reliability of the data drawn from the establishment survey and the actual amounts of revision due to benchmark adjustments are provided in tables M, O, P, and Q of that publication.

Table A-2. Employment status of the civilian population by sex and age

(Numbers in thousands)

Employment status, sex, and age	Not seasonally adjusted			Seasonally adjusted[1]					
	Mar. 1983	Feb. 1984	Mar. 1984	Mar. 1983	Nov. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984	Feb. 1984	Mar. 1984
TOTAL									
Civilian noninstitutional population	173,656	175,679	175,828	173,656	174,951	175,121	175,533	175,679	175,828
Civilian labor force	109,873	111,368	111,828	110,735	112,035	112,136	112,215	112,693	112,912
Participation rate	63.3	63.4	63.6	63.8	64.0	64.0	63.9	64.1	64.2
Employed	97,994	101,961	102,770	99,316	102,606	102,941	103,190	103,892	104,140
Employment-population ratio[2]	56.4	58.0	58.5	57.2	58.6	58.8	58.8	59.1	59.2
Unemployed	11,879	9,407	9,057	11,419	9,429	9,195	9,026	8,801	8,772
Unemployment rate	10.8	8.4	8.1	10.3	8.4	8.2	8.0	7.8	7.8
Men, 20 years and over									
Civilian noninstitutional population	74,528	75,786	75,880	74,528	75,327	75,433	75,492	75,786	75,880
Civilian labor force	58,220	58,964	59,104	58,268	59,053	59,050	59,299	59,394	59,388
Participation rate	78.1	77.8	77.9	78.2	78.4	78.3	78.1	78.4	78.3
Employed	51,982	54,220	54,630	52,673	54,457	54,658	54,999	55,246	55,364
Employment-population ratio[2]	69.7	71.5	72.0	70.7	72.1	72.5	72.7	72.9	73.0
Agriculture	2,214	2,156	2,156	2,425	2,336	2,374	2,156	2,409	2,364
Nonagricultural industries	49,768	52,064	52,474	50,248	52,121	52,284	52,843	52,857	53,000
Unemployed	6,239	4,743	4,474	5,595	4,596	4,392	4,300	4,148	4,020
Unemployment rate	10.7	8.0	7.6	9.6	7.8	7.4	7.3	7.0	6.8
Women, 20 years and over									
Civilian noninstitutional population	83,699	84,962	85,064	83,699	84,553	84,666	84,860	84,962	85,064
Civilian labor force	44,234	45,223	45,454	44,259	44,953	45,024	44,981	45,258	45,457
Participation rate	52.8	53.2	53.4	52.9	53.2	53.2	53.0	53.3	53.4
Employed	40,411	42,048	42,363	40,364	41,738	41,843	41,798	42,138	42,315
Employment-population ratio[2]	48.3	49.5	49.8	48.2	49.4	49.4	49.3	49.6	49.7
Agriculture	544	509	496	632	618	653	625	640	574
Nonagricultural industries	39,868	41,539	41,866	39,716	41,100	41,190	41,174	41,498	41,741
Unemployed	3,823	3,176	3,091	3,891	3,215	3,181	3,182	3,120	3,143
Unemployment rate	8.6	7.0	6.8	8.8	7.2	7.1	7.1	6.9	6.9
Both sexes, 16 to 19 years									
Civilian noninstitutional population	15,429	14,931	14,880	15,429	15,072	15,022	14,981	14,931	14,880
Civilian labor force	7,418	7,181	7,270	8,208	8,029	8,062	7,935	8,041	8,065
Participation rate	48.1	48.1	48.9	53.2	53.3	53.7	53.0	53.9	54.2
Employed	5,601	5,693	5,778	6,275	6,411	6,440	6,392	6,488	6,457
Employment-population ratio[2]	36.3	38.1	38.8	40.7	42.5	42.9	42.7	43.5	43.4
Agriculture	213	192	220	329	283	329	290	346	343
Nonagricultural industries	5,388	5,501	5,558	5,946	6,128	6,111	6,102	6,142	6,114
Unemployed	1,818	1,488	1,492	1,933	1,618	1,622	1,543	1,553	1,608
Unemployment rate	24.5	20.7	20.5	23.6	20.2	20.1	19.4	19.3	19.9

[1] The population figures are not adjusted for seasonal variation; therefore, identical numbers appear in the unadjusted and seasonally adjusted columns.

[2] Civilian employment as a percent of the civilian noninstitutional population.

HOUSEHOLD DATA

Table A-3. Employment status of the civilian population by race, sex, age, and Hispanic origin

(Numbers in thousands)

Employment status, race, sex, age, and Hispanic origin	Not seasonally adjusted			Seasonally adjusted[1]					
	Apr. 1983	Feb. 1984	Mar. 1984	Apr. 1983	Nov. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984	Feb. 1984	Mar. 1984
WHITE									
Civilian noninstitutional population	150,382	152,079	152,285	150,382	151,326	151,484	151,939	152,079	152,285
Civilian labor force	95,599	96,971	97,514	96,265	97,559	97,724	97,813	98,167	98,624
Participation rate	63.6	63.8	64.0	64.0	64.5	64.5	64.4	64.6	64.8
Employed	86,385	89,724	91,619	87,530	90,430	90,779	91,044	91,594	91,845
Employment-population ratio[2]	57.4	59.0	59.5	58.2	59.8	59.9	59.9	60.2	60.3
Unemployed	9,214	7,248	5,895	8,735	7,129	6,945	6,768	6,573	6,780
Unemployment rate	9.6	7.5	7.1	9.1	7.3	7.1	6.9	6.7	6.7
Men, 20 years and over									
Civilian labor force	51,298	51,916	52,126	51,320	52,021	52,063	52,270	52,335	52,398
Participation rate	78.5	78.2	78.4	78.6	78.9	78.9	78.8	78.8	78.8
Employed	46,320	48,166	48,652	46,992	48,616	48,589	48,964	49,149	49,303
Employment-population ratio[2]	70.9	72.5	73.1	71.9	73.5	73.6	73.8	74.0	74.2
Unemployed	4,977	3,750	3,474	4,328	3,407	3,474	3,306	3,186	3,095
Unemployment rate	9.7	7.2	6.7	8.5	6.9	6.7	6.3	6.1	5.8
Women, 20 years and over									
Civilian labor force	37,672	38,678	38,884	37,664	38,489	38,556	38,585	38,726	38,873
Participation rate	52.1	52.7	52.9	52.1	52.7	52.8	52.6	52.8	52.9
Employed	34,931	36,356	36,643	34,846	36,177	36,292	36,180	36,465	36,570
Employment-population ratio[2]	48.3	49.6	49.9	48.2	49.6	49.7	49.6	49.7	49.8
Unemployed	2,742	2,322	2,241	2,818	2,312	2,264	2,325	2,261	2,303
Unemployment rate	7.3	6.0	5.8	7.4	6.0	5.9	6.0	5.8	5.9
Both sexes, 16 to 19 years									
Civilian labor force	6,629	6,378	6,503	7,291	7,089	7,105	7,038	7,105	7,353
Participation rate	51.9	51.8	53.0	57.0	56.7	57.2	56.9	57.7	58.1
Employed	5,134	5,202	5,324	5,742	5,839	5,898	5,900	5,930	5,932
Employment-population ratio[2]	40.2	42.2	43.4	45.0	47.0	47.5	47.7	48.1	48.3
Unemployed	1,495	1,176	1,179	1,539	1,210	1,207	1,138	1,176	1,221
Unemployment rate	22.6	18.4	18.1	21.1	17.2	17.0	16.2	16.5	17.1
Men	25.0	19.6	19.3	22.6	17.6	17.5	17.8	16.6	17.1
Women	19.9	17.2	16.9	19.4	16.6	16.5	16.5	16.7	16.9
BLACK									
Civilian noninstitutional population	18,823	19,222	19,288	18,823	19,057	19,086	19,198	19,222	19,288
Civilian labor force	11,416	11,655	11,692	11,573	11,623	11,650	11,660	11,681	11,867
Participation rate	60.6	60.6	60.7	61.5	61.0	61.0	60.7	61.9	61.7
Employed	9,102	9,752	9,781	9,249	9,563	9,582	9,707	9,958	9,896
Employment-population ratio[2]	48.4	50.7	50.6	49.1	50.2	50.2	50.6	51.8	51.4
Unemployed	2,314	1,904	1,951	2,324	2,060	2,068	1,953	1,923	1,972
Unemployment rate	20.3	16.3	16.7	20.1	17.7	17.8	16.7	16.2	16.6
Men, 20 years and over									
Civilian labor force	5,940	5,630	5,619	5,966	5,568	5,565	5,621	5,677	5,660
Participation rate	70.5	74.8	74.5	74.8	74.9	74.7	74.8	75.4	74.9
Employed	4,359	4,770	4,722	4,820	4,701	4,722	4,789	4,877	4,789
Employment-population ratio[2]	59.7	63.4	62.6	60.5	63.2	63.4	63.7	64.8	63.5
Unemployed	1,081	860	897	1,046	867	843	833	800	871
Unemployment rate	19.9	15.3	16.0	19.1	15.6	15.1	14.8	14.1	15.4
Women, 20 years and over									
Civilian labor force	5,315	5,356	5,413	5,325	5,270	5,303	5,277	5,408	5,425
Participation rate	57.3	56.3	56.8	57.4	55.9	56.2	55.6	56.9	57.0
Employed	4,369	4,598	4,657	4,400	4,408	4,461	4,522	4,630	4,690
Employment-population ratio[2]	47.1	48.4	48.9	47.4	47.2	47.3	47.7	48.7	49.2
Unemployed	946	758	756	925	822	842	755	777	735
Unemployment rate	17.8	14.2	14.0	17.4	15.6	15.9	14.3	14.4	13.5
Both sexes, 16 to 19 years									
Civilian labor force	661	669	660	782	785	782	762	796	783
Participation rate	29.9	30.6	30.3	34.9	35.6	35.6	34.7	36.4	35.9
Employed	375	384	363	429	414	399	397	450	417
Unemployment rate	16.7	17.6	16.6	19.1	18.8	18.2	18.1	20.6	19.1
Unemployment rate	287	285	298	353	371	383	365	346	366
Men	43.3	42.6	45.1	45.1	47.3	49.0	47.9	43.5	46.7
Women	46.8	48.9	44.5	46.5	44.9	46.4	47.1	46.7	46.4
	38.9	36.1	46.0	43.5	50.0	51.9	48.8	39.9	49.6
HISPANIC ORIGIN									
Civilian noninstitutional population	9,551	9,906	10,080	9,551	9,677	9,735	9,778	9,906	10,080
Civilian labor force	5,998	6,167	6,392	6,070	6,232	6,267	6,336	6,292	6,486
Participation rate	62.8	62.3	63.4	63.6	64.4	64.4	64.8	63.5	64.3
Employed	5,017	5,477	5,636	5,114	5,463	5,540	5,627	5,652	5,751
Employment-population ratio[2]	52.5	55.3	55.9	53.5	56.5	56.9	57.6	57.1	57.1
Unemployed	980	690	756	956	769	727	708	639	733
Unemployment rate	16.3	11.2	11.8	15.7	12.3	11.6	11.2	10.2	11.3

[1] The population figures are not adjusted for seasonal variation; therefore, identical numbers appear in the unadjusted and seasonally adjusted columns.

[2] Civilian employment as a percent of the civilian noninstitutional population.

NOTE: Detail for the above race and Hispanic-origin groups will not sum to totals because data for the "other races" group are not presented and Hispanics are included in both the white and black population groups.

Table A-4. Selected employment indicators

(Numbers in thousands)

Category	Not seasonally adjusted			Seasonally adjusted					
	Mar. 1983	Feb. 1984	Mar. 1984	Mar. 1983	Nov. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984	Feb. 1984	Mar. 1984
CHARACTERISTIC									
Civilian employed, 16 years and over	97,998	101,961	102,770	99,316	102,606	102,961	103,190	103,092	104,140
Married men, spouse present	37,152	38,250	38,499	37,565	38,388	38,499	38,682	38,911	38,927
Married women, spouse present	24,316	25,162	25,140	24,220	25,057	25,140	24,947	25,212	25,239
Women who maintain families	5,066	5,389	5,417	5,093	5,236	5,254	5,293	5,346	5,444
MAJOR INDUSTRY AND CLASS OF WORKER									
Agriculture:									
Wage and salary workers	1,309	1,270	1,248	1,558	1,481	1,512	1,443	1,560	1,515
Self-employed workers	1,450	1,427	1,446	1,584	1,556	1,572	1,613	1,609	1,580
Unpaid family workers	212	160	158	265	224	265	233	232	198
Nonagricultural industries:									
Wage and salary workers	87,271	91,090	91,874	88,078	91,094	91,422	91,661	92,379	92,819
Government	15,746	16,075	16,082	15,479	15,585	15,481	15,515	15,822	15,813
Private industries	71,526	74,985	75,792	72,599	75,509	75,941	76,146	76,557	77,006
Private households	1,188	1,154	1,111	1,234	1,218	1,241	1,197	1,218	1,195
Other industries	70,342	73,851	74,681	71,365	74,293	74,700	74,949	75,339	75,811
Self-employed workers	7,378	7,731	7,670	7,456	7,800	7,734	7,916	7,969	7,755
Unpaid family workers	374	293	354	344	478	450	464	330	326
PERSONS AT WORK[1]									
Nonagricultural industries	91,151	95,249	95,623	90,450	93,834	94,173	94,707	95,067	94,982
Full-time schedules	71,950	76,255	76,850	72,035	75,398	75,802	76,237	76,715	77,006
Part time for economic reasons	6,023	5,634	5,319	6,169	5,848	5,712	5,983	5,830	5,661
Usually work full time	1,966	1,706	1,496	1,938	1,719	1,672	1,771	1,611	1,472
Usually work part time	4,057	3,928	3,823	4,235	4,129	4,040	4,172	4,197	4,191
Part time for noneconomic reasons	13,178	13,360	13,454	12,244	12,588	12,659	12,527	12,945	12,515

[1] Excludes persons "with a job but not at work" during the survey period for such reasons as vacation, illness, or industrial dispute.

Table A-5. Range of unemployment measures based on varying definitions of unemployment and the labor force, seasonally adjusted

(Percent)

Measure	Quarterly averages					Monthly data		
	1983				1984	1984		
	I	II	III	IV	I	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.
U-1 Persons unemployed 15 weeks or longer as a percent of the civilian labor force	4.2	4.0	3.7	3.1	2.7	2.9	2.6	2.5
U-2 Job losers as a percent of the civilian labor force	6.2	6.0	5.6	4.7	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.1
U-3 Unemployed persons 25 years and over as a percent of the civilian labor force	8.1	7.9	7.3	6.6	6.1	6.2	6.1	5.9
U-4 Unemployed full-time jobseekers as a percent of the full-time civilian labor force	10.3	10.0	9.3	8.3	7.6	7.8	7.5	7.5
U-5a Total unemployed as a percent of the labor force, including the resident Armed Forces	10.2	10.0	9.3	8.4	7.8	7.9	7.7	7.7
U-5b Total unemployed as a percent of the civilian labor force	10.4	10.1	9.4	8.5	7.9	8.0	7.8	7.8
U-6 Total full-time jobseekers plus ½ part-time jobseekers plus ½ total on part time for economic reasons as a percent of the civilian labor force less ½ of the part-time labor force	13.8	12.9	12.2	11.2	10.5	10.8	10.4	10.3
U-7 Total full-time jobseekers plus ½ part-time jobseekers plus ½ total on part time for economic reasons plus discouraged workers as a percent of the civilian labor force plus discouraged workers less ½ of the part-time labor force	14.9	14.4	13.5	12.4	11.6	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.

N.A. = not available.

HOUSEHOLD DATA

HOUSEHOLD DATA

Table A-6. Selected unemployment indicators, seasonally adjusted

Category	Number of unemployed persons (in thousands)			Unemployment rates[1]					
	Mar. 1983	Feb. 1984	Mar. 1984	Mar. 1983	Nov. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984	Feb. 1984	Mar. 1984
CHARACTERISTIC									
Total, 16 years and over	11,819	8,801	8,772	10.3	8.4	8.2	8.0	7.8	7.8
Men, 16 years and over	6,673	4,966	4,867	10.7	8.6	8.3	8.1	7.8	7.7
Men, 20 years and over	5,595	4,128	4,020	9.6	7.8	7.6	7.3	7.0	6.8
Women, 16 years and over	4,746	3,855	3,905	9.9	8.2	8.1	7.9	7.8	7.9
Women, 20 years and over	3,891	3,120	3,144	8.8	7.2	7.1	7.1	6.9	6.9
Both sexes, 16 to 19 years	1,931	1,553	1,608	23.6	20.2	20.1	19.4	19.3	19.9
Married men, spouse present	2,884	1,933	1,910	7.1	5.5	5.2	5.0	4.9	4.7
Married women, spouse present	1,975	1,579	1,560	7.5	6.0	6.1	6.0	5.9	5.8
Women who maintain families	784	658	672	13.3	10.5	10.9	10.7	11.0	11.0
Full-time workers	9,744	7,283	7,301	10.2	8.2	8.0	7.8	7.5	7.5
Part-time workers	1,665	1,459	1,465	10.6	9.8	9.8	9.2	9.1	9.2
Labor force time lost[2]	--	--	--	11.7	9.7	9.4	9.2	8.9	8.6
INDUSTRY									
Nonagricultural private wage and salary workers	8,714	6,478	6,349	10.7	8.6	8.3	7.9	7.9	7.6
Mining	210	127	112	19.2	12.8	12.4	10.9	12.2	11.2
Construction	1,071	881	776	20.2	15.6	16.3	15.0	15.1	13.3
Manufacturing	2,807	1,695	1,651	12.8	8.9	8.3	8.4	7.5	7.5
Durable goods	1,838	985	1,008	14.3	9.0	8.3	8.0	7.3	7.8
Nondurable goods	969	696	643	10.8	8.7	8.2	8.9	7.8	7.2
Transportation and public utilities	437	386	297	7.6	6.7	6.5	5.1	5.9	5.0
Wholesale and retail trade	2,251	1,776	1,768	10.9	9.1	8.8	8.6	8.3	8.3
Finance and service industries	1,938	1,703	1,795	7.3	6.7	6.6	6.3	6.3	6.8
Government workers	963	747	716	5.7	4.8	5.0	5.0	4.5	4.9
Agricultural wage and salary workers	295	253	260	15.9	15.7	15.6	15.5	14.0	14.6

[1] Unemployed as a percent of the civilian labor force.

[2] Aggregate hours lost by the unemployed and persons on part time for economic reasons as a percent of potentially available labor force hours.

Table A-7. Duration of unemployment

(Numbers in thousands)

Weeks of unemployment	Not seasonally adjusted			Seasonally adjusted					
	Mar. 1983	Feb. 1984	Mar. 1984	Mar. 1983	Nov. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984	Feb. 1984	Mar. 1984
DURATION									
Less than 5 weeks	3,127	3,157	3,983	3,535	3,328	3,382	3,231	3,359	3,386
5 to 14 weeks	3,423	2,986	2,735	3,173	2,616	2,508	2,556	2,484	2,519
15 weeks and over	5,330	3,264	3,339	4,587	3,527	3,369	3,201	2,984	2,871
15 to 26 weeks	2,352	1,354	1,417	1,981	1,337	1,288	1,166	1,173	1,118
27 weeks and over	2,978	1,910	1,923	2,726	2,190	2,085	2,035	1,810	1,759
Average (mean) duration, in weeks	20.7	19.2	20.2	19.2	20.2	19.6	20.5	18.8	18.8
Median duration, in weeks	12.9	9.3	10.3	10.4	9.4	9.0	9.2	8.3	8.3
PERCENT DISTRIBUTION									
Total unemployed	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Less than 5 weeks	26.3	33.6	32.9	31.3	35.1	36.5	36.0	38.1	38.5
5 to 14 weeks	28.8	31.7	30.2	28.1	27.6	27.1	28.4	28.1	28.9
15 weeks and over	44.9	34.7	36.9	40.6	37.2	36.4	35.6	33.8	32.7
15 to 26 weeks	19.8	14.4	15.6	14.5	14.1	13.9	13.0	13.3	12.7
27 weeks and over	25.1	20.3	21.2	24.1	23.1	22.5	22.6	20.5	20.0

Table A-8. Reason for unemployment

(Numbers in thousands)

Reason	Not seasonally adjusted			Seasonally adjusted					
	Mar. 1983	Feb. 1984	Mar. 1984	Mar. 1983	Nov. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984	Feb. 1984	Mar. 1984
NUMBER OF UNEMPLOYED									
Job losers	7,960	5,871	5,089	6,848	5,226	5,017	4,825	4,737	4,614
On layoff	2,336	1,613	1,452	2,005	1,321	1,283	1,238	1,272	1,254
Other job losers	5,224	3,858	3,637	4,843	3,905	3,734	3,588	3,465	3,360
Job leavers	858	787	730	888	868	855	809	772	756
Reentrants	2,907	2,168	2,157	2,460	2,250	2,246	2,192	2,153	2,208
New entrants	1,056	981	1,082	1,182	1,150	1,150	1,175	1,092	1,213
PERCENT DISTRIBUTION									
Total unemployed	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Job losers	63.7	58.1	56.2	60.2	59.0	58.1	57.6	58.1	57.5
On layoff	19.7	17.1	16.0	17.6	13.9	13.8	13.7	14.5	14.1
Other job losers	44.0	41.0	40.2	42.6	41.1	40.3	39.9	39.6	38.4
Job leavers	7.2	8.4	8.1	7.8	9.1	9.2	9.0	8.8	8.6
Reentrants	20.3	23.0	23.8	21.6	23.7	24.2	24.4	24.6	25.1
New entrants	8.9	10.4	11.9	10.4	12.1	12.4	13.1	12.5	13.8
UNEMPLOYED AS A PERCENT OF THE CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE									
Job losers	6.9	4.9	4.6	6.2	4.7	4.5	4.3	4.2	4.1
Job leavers	.8	.7	.7	.8	.8	.8	.7	.7	.7
Reentrants	2.2	1.9	1.9	2.2	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.9	2.0
New entrants	1.0	.9	1.0	1.1	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.1

Table A-9. Unemployed persons by sex and age, seasonally adjusted

Sex and age	Number of unemployed persons (in thousands)			Unemployment rates[1]					
	Mar. 1983	Feb. 1984	Mar. 1984	Mar. 1983	Nov. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984	Feb. 1984	Mar. 1984
Total, 16 years and over	11,619	8,001	8,772	10.3	8.4	8.2	8.0	7.8	7.8
16 to 24 years	4,398	3,410	3,467	18.2	15.4	14.9	14.4	14.2	14.4
16 to 19 years	1,933	1,553	1,608	23.6	20.2	20.1	19.4	19.3	19.9
16 to 17 years	786	663	712	25.4	21.9	22.9	21.9	22.1	23.1
18 to 19 years	1,157	881	906	22.6	19.3	18.8	17.6	17.5	18.1
20 to 24 years	2,465	1,857	1,859	15.4	13.0	12.2	12.5	11.6	11.6
25 years and over	6,998	5,405	5,379	8.1	6.5	6.4	6.3	6.1	5.9
25 to 54 years	6,209	4,762	4,647	8.7	6.9	6.8	6.5	6.4	6.1
55 years and over	807	636	643	5.4	3.9	4.9	4.7	4.3	4.2
Men, 16 years and over	6,673	4,946	4,867	10.7	8.6	8.3	8.1	7.8	7.7
16 to 24 years	2,486	1,857	1,869	19.4	15.9	15.6	15.6	14.6	14.6
16 to 19 years	1,078	818	847	25.1	20.2	20.4	20.8	19.7	20.0
16 to 17 years	631	337	376	26.3	22.0	23.3	21.6	21.6	23.0
18 to 19 years	449	469	472	24.4	19.6	18.9	19.6	18.1	18.2
20 to 24 years	1,408	1,039	1,022	16.6	13.8	13.3	13.1	12.1	11.9
25 years and over	4,178	3,089	2,988	8.4	6.8	6.5	6.2	6.1	5.9
25 to 54 years	3,656	2,686	2,569	9.0	7.1	6.7	6.6	6.4	6.1
55 years and over	518	396	408	5.8	5.4	5.4	4.8	4.5	4.6
Women, 16 years and over	4,746	3,055	3,905	9.9	8.2	8.1	7.9	7.8	7.9
16 to 24 years	1,912	1,552	1,598	16.8	14.7	14.0	13.9	13.7	14.1
16 to 19 years	855	735	761	21.9	20.1	19.8	18.0	18.9	19.8
16 to 17 years	355	326	336	24.4	21.8	22.5	22.2	22.6	23.1
18 to 19 years	508	412	432	20.6	19.0	18.7	15.4	16.9	18.1
20 to 24 years	1,057	817	837	14.1	12.0	11.0	11.7	11.0	11.3
25 years and over	2,821	2,316	2,391	7.7	6.7	6.3	6.2	6.1	6.0
25 to 54 years	2,553	2,057	2,078	8.3	6.6	6.8	6.5	6.5	6.5
55 years and over	289	240	235	4.8	4.1	4.3	4.5	4.0	3.9

[1] Unemployment as a percent of the civilian labor force.

Table A-10. Employment status of black and other workers

(Numbers in thousands)

Employment status	Not seasonally adjusted			Seasonally adjusted[1]					
	Mar. 1983	Feb. 1984	Mar. 1984	Mar. 1983	Nov. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984	Feb. 1984	Mar. 1984
Civilian noninstitutional population	23,275	23,600	23,539	23,275	23,627	23,637	23,594	23,600	23,539
Civilian labor force	14,276	14,397	14,314	14,461	14,509	14,539	14,425	14,593	14,521
Participation rate	61.3	61.0	60.8	62.1	61.4	61.5	61.1	61.8	61.7
Employed	11,609	12,237	12,151	11,777	12,171	12,171	12,179	12,417	12,325
Employment-population ratio[2]	49.9	51.9	51.6	50.6	51.5	51.5	51.6	52.6	52.4
Unemployed	2,665	2,159	2,163	2,684	2,338	2,368	2,246	2,176	2,195
Unemployment rate	18.7	15.0	15.1	18.6	16.1	16.3	15.6	14.9	15.1
Not in labor force	9,000	9,204	9,225	8,814	9,118	9,098	9,169	9,007	9,018

[1] The population figures are not adjusted for seasonal variation; therefore, identical numbers appear in the unadjusted and seasonally adjusted columns.

[2] Civilian employment as a percent of the civilian noninstitutional population.

Table A-11. Occupational status of the employed and unemployed, not seasonally adjusted

(Numbers in thousands)

Occupation	Civilian employed		Unemployed		Unemployment rate	
	Mar. 1983	Mar. 1984	Mar. 1983	Mar. 1984	Mar. 1983	Mar. 1984
Total, 16 years and over[1]	97,994	102,770	11,079	9,057	10.8	8.1
Managerial and professional specialty	23,435	26,969	890	688	3.5	2.4
Executive, administrative, and managerial	10,583	11,509	453	350	4.1	3.0
Professional specialty	12,852	15,460	387	257	2.9	1.6
Technical, sales, and administrative support	30,715	31,876	2,218	1,755	6.7	5.2
Technicians and related support	3,005	3,188	162	86	5.1	2.6
Sales occupations	11,549	12,185	890	723	7.2	5.6
Administrative support, including clerical	16,161	16,452	1,166	948	6.7	5.5
Service occupations	13,507	13,940	1,792	1,473	11.7	9.6
Private household	962	898	66	88	6.4	8.6
Protective service	1,640	1,604	137	114	7.7	6.6
Service, except private household and protective	10,904	11,438	1,588	1,270	12.7	10.0
Precision production, craft, and repair	11,774	12,563	1,672	1,266	13.7	9.1
Mechanics and repairers	4,116	4,257	396	284	8.8	6.3
Construction trades	3,867	4,204	958	691	19.9	14.1
Other precision production, craft, and repair	3,791	4,102	519	289	12.0	6.6
Operators, fabricators, and laborers	15,404	16,437	3,566	2,421	18.8	12.8
Machine operators, assemblers, and inspectors	7,522	7,885	1,737	1,027	18.8	11.5
Transportation and material moving occupations	3,987	4,321	777	545	16.3	11.2
Handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers, and laborers	3,895	4,231	1,052	850	21.1	16.7
Construction laborers	479	567	262	216	35.3	27.6
Other handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers, and laborers	3,417	3,664	790	634	18.8	14.8
Farming, forestry, and fishing	3,157	3,035	456	381	12.6	11.2

[1] Persons with no previous work experience and those whose last job was in the Armed Forces are included in the unemployed total.

HOUSEHOLD DATA

Table A-12. Employment status of male Vietnam-era veterans and nonveterans by age, not seasonally adjusted

(Numbers in thousands)

Veteran status and age	Civilian noninstitutional population		Civilian labor force							
			Total		Employed		Unemployed			
							Number		Percent of labor force	
	Mar. 1983	Mar. 1984	Mar. 1983	Mar. 1984	Mar. 1983	Mar. 1984	Mar. 1983	Mar. 1984	Mar. 1983	Mar. 1984
VETERANS										
Total, 25 years and over	8,270	7,914	7,773	7,412	6,938	6,915	835	497	10.7	6.7
25 to 39 years	6,509	5,617	6,210	5,379	5,488	4,996	722	383	11.6	7.1
25 to 29 years	916	562	857	507	687	459	170	48	19.8	9.5
30 to 34 years	2,465	1,855	2,339	1,761	2,040	1,611	299	150	12.8	8.5
35 to 39 years	3,128	3,220	3,014	3,111	2,761	2,926	253	185	8.4	5.9
40 years and over	1,761	2,297	1,563	2,033	1,450	1,919	113	114	7.2	5.6
NONVETERANS										
Total, 25 to 39 years	19,377	26,793	18,297	19,548	16,280	18,078	2,017	1,466	11.0	7.5
25 to 29 years	8,520	6,889	8,016	6,274	6,900	7,526	1,116	748	13.9	9.0
30 to 34 years	6,512	7,222	6,156	6,830	5,586	6,375	570	455	9.3	6.7
35 to 39 years	4,345	4,682	4,125	4,440	3,794	4,177	331	263	8.0	5.9

NOTE: Male Vietnam-era veterans are men who served in the Armed Forces between August 5, 1964 and May 7, 1975. Nonveterans are men who have never served in the Armed Forces; published data are limited to those 25 to 39 years of age, the group that most closely corresponds to the bulk of the Vietnam-era veteran population.

HOUSEHOLD DATA

Table A-13. Persons not in labor force by reason, sex, and race, quarterly averages

(In thousands)

Reason, sex, and race	Not seasonally adjusted		Seasonally adjusted				
	1983	1984	1983				1984
	I	I	I	II	III	IV	I
TOTAL							
Total not in labor force	63,739	64,272	62,805	62,480	62,392	62,938	63,072
Do not want a job now	56,941	57,823	56,106	55,986	55,690	56,526	56,957
Current activity: Going to school	6,289	6,412	6,607	6,399	6,462	6,540	6,713
Ill, disabled	3,933	4,013	3,975	4,066	3,809	3,814	4,096
Keeping house	28,184	28,315	28,150	28,281	28,267	28,533	28,484
Retired	13,050	13,584	12,967	13,003	12,692	13,196	13,066
Other	3,507	3,518	4,185	4,239	4,264	4,837	4,194
Want a job now							
Reason not looking: School attendance	6,797	6,850	6,952	6,540	6,746	6,735	6,782
Ill health, disability	1,933	1,788	1,641	1,518	1,832	1,538	1,526
Home responsibilities	702	730	656	701	841	868	686
Think cannot get a job	1,360	1,470	1,390	1,436	1,442	1,384	1,503
Job-market factors[1]	1,872	1,817	1,765	1,726	1,610	1,447	1,139
Personal factors[2]	1,099	1,000	1,408	1,316	1,197	1,046	938
Other reasons[3]	373	417	357	411	413	411	401
	931	1,044	1,080	1,159	1,032	1,089	1,124
Men							
Total not in labor force	20,186	20,532	19,657	19,855	19,337	19,626	19,752
Do not want a job now	17,789	18,329	17,227	17,187	16,968	17,473	17,743
Want a job now							
Reason not looking: School attendance	2,417	2,203	2,187	2,203	2,409	2,173	2,013
Ill health, disability	1,046	962	869	775	1,079	826	806
Think cannot get a job	309	357	289	308	379	340	337
Other reasons[3]	754	528	695	683	607	620	486
	307	357	334	436	345	344	385
Women							
Total not in labor force	43,553	43,740	43,148	43,226	43,056	43,311	43,320
Do not want a job now	39,172	39,494	38,877	38,799	38,723	39,053	39,204
Want a job now							
Reason not looking: School attendance	4,381	4,266	4,265	4,338	4,347	4,162	4,168
Ill health, disability	886	826	772	743	753	711	720
Home responsibilities	393	373	367	393	462	488	349
Think cannot get a job	1,360	1,470	1,390	1,436	1,442	1,384	1,503
Other reasons	1,117	889	1,070	1,043	1,003	836	853
	624	688	666	723	687	743	743
White							
Total not in labor force	54,733	55,017	53,970	53,947	53,574	53,786	53,966
Do not want a job now	49,817	50,431	49,114	49,132	48,869	49,099	49,702
Want a job now							
Reason not looking: School attendance	4,917	4,585	4,738	4,775	4,738	4,605	4,447
Ill health, disability	1,384	1,233	1,211	1,189	1,189	1,105	1,082
Home responsibilities	487	536	488	510	634	615	538
Think cannot get a job	1,020	1,068	1,053	1,083	1,061	1,033	1,100
Other reasons	1,284	953	1,194	1,245	1,076	974	984
	742	796	787	907	819	872	847
Black							
Total not in labor force	7,403	7,614	7,237	7,210	7,240	7,444	7,419
Do not want a job now	5,754	5,994	5,652	5,688	5,556	5,917	5,894
Want a job now	1,649	1,619	1,570	1,514	1,679	1,555	1,584
Reason not looking: School attendance	477	483	484	330	476	425	402
Ill health, disability	194	172	171	170	207	193	180
Home responsibilities	312	354	311	354	354	308	352
Think cannot get a job	516	415	532	431	473	458	407
Other reasons	150	215	172	230	169	171	243

[1] Job market factors include "could not find job" and "thinks no job available."

[2] Personal factors include "employers think too young or old," "lacks education or training," and "other personal handicap."

[3] Includes small number of men not looking for work because of home responsibilities.

HOUSEHOLD DATA

HOUSEHOLD DATA

Table A 14 Employment status of the civilian population for ten large States

(Numbers in thousands)

State and employment status	Not seasonally adjusted[1]			Seasonally adjusted[2]					
	Mar. 1983	Feb. 1984	Mar. 1984	Mar. 1983	Nov. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984	Feb. 1984	Mar. 1984
California									
Civilian noninstitutional population	18,699	19,009	19,035	18,699	18,930	18,954	18,983	19,009	19,035
Civilian labor force	12,173	12,304	12,366	12,253	12,409	12,389	12,395	12,363	12,451
Employed	10,862	11,236	11,302	10,959	11,367	11,388	11,350	11,380	11,425
Unemployed	1,311	1,082	1,065	1,294	1,041	1,001	1,045	983	1,026
Unemployment rate	10.9	8.8	8.6	10.6	8.4	8.1	8.4	8.0	8.2
Florida									
Civilian noninstitutional population	8,289	8,473	8,491	8,285	8,418	8,435	8,455	8,473	8,491
Civilian labor force	4,611	4,991	4,980	4,727	5,009	5,097	5,067	5,065	5,105
Employed	4,202	4,685	4,713	4,306	4,619	4,717	4,713	4,760	4,826
Unemployed	409	306	267	421	390	380	354	305	279
Unemployment rate	8.9	6.1	5.4	8.9	7.8	7.5	7.0	6.0	5.5
Illinois									
Civilian noninstitutional population	8,568	8,590	8,591	8,568	8,586	8,586	8,588	8,590	8,591
Civilian labor force	5,643	5,549	5,569	5,701	5,546	5,540	5,553	5,589	5,625
Employed	4,937	4,990	4,976	4,999	5,011	5,008	5,005	5,067	5,036
Unemployed	706	559	592	702	533	532	548	532	589
Unemployment rate	12.5	10.1	10.6	12.3	9.6	9.6	9.9	9.5	10.5
Massachusetts									
Civilian noninstitutional population	4,476	4,501	4,503	4,476	4,496	4,497	4,499	4,501	4,503
Civilian labor force	2,940	2,986	3,002	2,963	3,014	3,017	3,028	3,033	3,024
Employed	2,704	2,797	2,826	2,740	2,814	2,823	2,831	2,840	2,865
Unemployed	236	189	175	223	200	194	197	193	161
Unemployment rate	8.0	6.3	5.8	7.5	6.6	6.4	6.5	5.7	5.3
Michigan									
Civilian noninstitutional population	6,749	6,733	6,731	6,749	6,740	6,737	6,736	6,733	6,731
Civilian labor force	4,234	4,245	4,296	4,324	4,216	4,241	4,207	4,305	4,385
Employed	3,517	3,709	3,757	3,647	3,696	3,748	3,722	3,815	3,891
Unemployed	722	535	539	677	520	493	485	490	494
Unemployment rate	17.0	12.6	12.5	15.7	12.3	11.6	11.5	11.4	11.3
New Jersey									
Civilian noninstitutional population	5,736	5,779	5,783	5,734	5,769	5,772	5,776	5,779	5,783
Civilian labor force	3,574	3,761	3,800	3,598	3,685	3,762	3,774	3,811	3,822
Employed	3,250	3,504	3,518	3,297	3,428	3,503	3,503	3,575	3,565
Unemployed	325	253	282	301	257	259	271	236	257
Unemployment rate	9.1	6.7	7.4	8.4	7.0	6.9	7.2	6.2	6.7
New York									
Civilian noninstitutional population	13,535	13,609	13,613	13,535	13,596	13,599	13,605	13,609	13,613
Civilian labor force	8,024	7,995	8,076	8,010	8,098	8,056	7,939	8,024	8,061
Employed	7,234	7,346	7,458	7,278	7,476	7,455	7,353	7,432	7,501
Unemployed	790	649	618	732	622	601	586	592	560
Unemployment rate	9.8	8.1	7.7	9.1	7.7	7.5	7.4	7.4	6.9
Ohio									
Civilian noninstitutional population	8,040	8,050	8,050	8,040	8,051	8,050	8,050	8,050	8,050
Civilian labor force	5,015	4,925	4,960	5,097	5,113	5,097	5,095	5,082	5,039
Employed	4,329	4,426	4,435	4,435	4,557	4,561	4,619	4,607	4,513
Unemployed	686	499	525	672	556	536	476	475	512
Unemployment rate	13.7	10.1	10.6	13.2	10.9	10.5	9.3	9.3	10.2
Pennsylvania									
Civilian noninstitutional population	9,173	9,200	9,202	9,173	9,195	9,196	9,198	9,200	9,202
Civilian labor force	5,320	5,344	5,378	5,402	5,554	5,519	5,451	5,421	5,365
Employed	4,582	4,758	4,772	4,690	4,969	4,963	4,907	4,888	4,887
Unemployed	738	586	606	712	585	556	454	533	478
Unemployment rate	13.9	11.0	9.4	13.2	10.5	10.4	8.3	9.8	8.9
Texas									
Civilian noninstitutional population	11,180	11,455	11,480	11,180	11,378	11,402	11,429	11,455	11,480
Civilian labor force	7,537	7,625	7,790	7,567	7,657	7,743	7,648	7,832	7,817
Employed	6,881	7,175	7,281	6,908	7,124	7,146	7,114	7,199	7,307
Unemployed	656	450	509	659	535	597	534	633	510
Unemployment rate	8.7	5.9	6.5	8.7	7.0	7.7	6.9	8.1	6.5

[1] These are the official Bureau of Labor Statistics' estimates used in the administration of Federal fund allocation programs.

[2] The population figures are not adjusted for seasonal variation; therefore, identical numbers appear in the unadjusted and the seasonally adjusted columns.

ESTABLISHMENT DATA

Table B-1. Employees on nonagricultural payrolls by industry

(In thousands)

Industry	Not seasonally adjusted				Seasonally adjusted					
	Mar. 1983	Jan. 1984	Feb. 1984 p	Mar. 1984 p	Mar. 1983	Nov. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984	Feb. 1984 p	Mar. 1984 p
Total	88,172	90,835	91,135	91,748	89,814	91,355	91,599	91,930	92,347	92,490
Total private	72,121	74,889	75,111	75,699	73,090	75,579	75,829	76,188	76,571	76,728
Goods-producing	22,615	23,985	24,114	24,329	23,039	24,311	24,415	24,617	24,772	24,787
Mining	996	1,043	1,040	1,044	1,006	1,045	1,047	1,051	1,053	1,052
Oil and gas extraction	628.8	669.3	657.1	653.9	636	655	663	662	661	662
Construction	3,453	3,772	3,767	3,835	3,757	4,094	4,088	4,177	4,228	4,178
General building contractors	891.4	1,014.0	1,006.1	1,024.0	984	1,082	1,075	1,108	1,114	1,107
Manufacturing	18,166	19,170	19,307	19,454	18,267	19,172	19,280	19,389	19,491	19,551
Production workers	12,241	13,122	13,265	13,374	12,523	13,147	13,230	13,342	13,435	13,455
Durable goods	10,594	11,364	11,449	11,584	10,617	11,320	11,406	11,477	11,567	11,617
Production workers	6,944	7,673	7,719	7,817	6,981	7,601	7,669	7,735	7,823	7,874
Lumber and wood products	620.9	688.6	693.8	704.0	638	714	715	717	719	724
Furniture and fixtures	481.3	476.9	481.7	484.1	471	470	473	477	482	485
Stone, clay, and glass products	561.9	569.4	575.3	589.4	559	590	584	593	602	604
Primary metal industries	820.8	869.2	875.6	882.5	816	871	861	872	878	876
Blast furnaces and basic steel products	332.6	337.0	338.8	340.7	330	342	343	336	338	336
Fabricated metal products	1,359.7	1,446.4	1,454.0	1,465.7	1,362	1,438	1,449	1,458	1,471	1,469
Machinery, except electrical	2,044.3	2,184.4	2,206.3	2,229.6	2,030	2,158	2,172	2,187	2,207	2,214
Electrical and electronic equipment	1,980.0	2,158.8	2,177.8	2,200.1	1,988	2,128	2,146	2,165	2,189	2,215
Transportation equipment	1,729.7	1,886.0	1,912.3	1,931.1	1,723	1,862	1,887	1,909	1,910	1,922
Motor vehicles and equipment	724.6	846.3	864.4	876.3	725	821	846	871	880	877
Instruments and related products	688.2	703.0	703.9	709.3	691	701	701	706	707	712
Miscellaneous manufacturing	373.1	381.0	388.0	392.7	377	388	393	393	397	397
Nondurable goods	7,574	7,806	7,858	7,866	7,650	7,852	7,874	7,912	7,924	7,918
Production workers	5,297	5,449	5,546	5,557	5,362	5,546	5,565	5,597	5,602	5,621
Food and kindred products	1,362.1	1,389.8	1,381.2	1,381.1	1,619	1,633	1,632	1,642	1,639	1,638
Tobacco manufactures	63.7	63.4	60.8	60.5	67	61	62	61	61	61
Textile mill products	727.5	759.9	760.1	763.4	730	758	759	766	763	766
Apparel and other textile products	1,144.1	1,188.0	1,210.3	1,215.1	1,143	1,199	1,206	1,210	1,214	1,215
Paper and allied products	668.9	666.9	668.3	669.4	652	666	671	671	674	672
Printing and publishing	1,271.2	1,309.5	1,314.2	1,321.4	1,269	1,301	1,309	1,310	1,313	1,317
Chemicals and allied products	1,059.4	1,057.3	1,061.0	1,065.3	1,059	1,061	1,064	1,065	1,065	1,066
Petroleum and coal products	195.2	187.7	186.8	188.2	189	193	192	192	191	192
Rubber and miscellaneous plastics products	695.4	769.6	780.7	789.2	699	762	769	777	786	793
Leather and leather products	214.6	213.9	214.3	212.4	216	218	217	218	218	216
Service-producing	65,557	66,850	67,019	67,419	66,784	67,044	67,184	67,313	67,575	67,708
Transportation and public utilities	4,913	4,991	4,994	5,013	4,983	5,019	5,015	5,057	5,067	5,069
Transportation	2,659	2,739	2,749	2,766	2,695	2,749	2,747	2,792	2,813	2,816
Communication and public utilities	2,254	2,252	2,245	2,247	2,288	2,270	2,269	2,266	2,254	2,254
Wholesale trade	5,145	5,308	5,313	5,343	5,175	5,291	5,313	5,343	5,361	5,378
Durable goods	3,009	3,132	3,144	3,164	3,018	3,114	3,132	3,150	3,167	3,176
Nondurable goods	2,136	2,168	2,167	2,178	2,158	2,178	2,182	2,194	2,195	2,199
Retail trade	14,610	15,300	15,128	15,192	15,174	15,427	15,448	15,517	15,564	15,566
General merchandise stores	2,099.3	2,325.6	2,199.0	2,182.7	2,182	2,266	2,228	2,265	2,262	2,269
Food stores	2,499.4	2,513.2	2,505.0	2,497.9	2,476	2,510	2,505	2,528	2,535	2,533
Automotive dealers and service stations	1,580.3	1,642.1	1,641.4	1,650.3	1,596	1,636	1,639	1,649	1,665	1,667
Eating and drinking places	4,723.7	4,883.8	4,887.4	4,761.1	4,875	4,899	4,910	4,925	4,911	4,916
Finance, insurance, and real estate	5,359	5,514	5,521	5,538	5,391	5,515	5,525	5,553	5,566	5,571
Finance	2,662	2,772	2,777	2,787	2,683	2,763	2,767	2,772	2,782	2,789
Insurance	1,706	1,722	1,725	1,727	1,707	1,717	1,718	1,727	1,731	1,727
Real estate	974	1,020	1,019	1,024	1,002	1,035	1,040	1,053	1,053	1,054
Services	19,279	19,799	20,034	20,294	19,356	20,014	20,093	20,101	20,241	20,365
Business services	3,403.1	3,810.4	3,835.9	3,936.6	3,434	3,748	3,808	3,833	3,890	3,942
Health services	5,893.8	5,981.8	5,991.9	6,020.7	5,906	5,983	5,994	5,994	6,010	6,032
Government	16,051	15,746	16,022	16,049	15,724	15,776	15,770	15,742	15,776	15,762
Federal	2,731	2,740	2,744	2,750	2,742	2,763	2,768	2,762	2,780	2,761
State	3,723	3,619	3,748	3,765	3,626	3,646	3,646	3,643	3,668	3,667
Local	9,594	9,388	9,528	9,574	9,356	9,367	9,356	9,337	9,350	9,334

p = preliminary.

ESTABLISHMENT DATA

Table B-2. Average weekly hours of production or nonsupervisory workers[1] on private nonagricultural payrolls by industry

Industry	Not seasonally adjusted				Seasonally adjusted					
	Mar. 1983	Jan. 1984	Feb. 1984 p	Mar. 1984 p	Mar. 1983	Nov. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984	Feb. 1984 p	Mar. 1984 p
Total private	34.7	35.0	35.1	35.[illegible]	34.8	35.2	35.3	35.5	35.4	35.2
Mining	41.8	43.4	43.2	42.7	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Construction	36.4	36.3	37.0	36.6	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Manufacturing	39.6	40.6	40.7	40.6	38.5	40.6	40.5	41.0	41.0	40.5
Overtime hours	2.5	3.4	3.4	3.4	2.6	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.6	3.4
Durable goods	40.1	41.3	41.4	41.3	39.9	41.2	41.1	41.8	41.7	41.1
Overtime hours	2.5	3.5	3.6	3.6	2.5	3.5	3.5	3.7	3.7	3.6
Lumber and wood products	39.4	39.4	39.7	39.5	39.6	39.7	39.7	40.8	40.4	39.6
Furniture and fixtures	38.6	39.0	39.1	39.2	38.3	39.7	40.1	40.2	39.7	38.9
Stone, clay, and glass products	40.9	40.9	41.5	41.4	40.6	41.7	41.6	42.3	42.0	41.6
Primary metal industries	39.7	41.9	42.0	41.8	39.6	41.6	41.8	41.9	42.0	41.5
Blast furnaces and basic steel products	38.1	40.9	41.2	41.1	37.8	40.4	41.3	40.8	41.1	40.8
Fabricated metal products	39.9	41.4	41.5	41.4	39.7	41.4	41.4	41.8	41.9	41.2
Machinery, except electrical	40.0	41.8	42.0	41.9	39.7	41.3	41.4	41.8	42.0	41.5
Electrical and electronic equipment	40.0	41.2	41.1	41.1	39.8	41.1	40.9	41.4	41.3	40.8
Transportation equipment	41.8	42.9	42.9	42.9	41.7	42.5	41.9	43.4	43.2	42.8
Motor vehicles and equipment	42.5	44.3	44.0	44.5	43.9	43.8	42.9	45.4	44.4	44.[illegible]
Instruments and related products	40.2	41.1	41.1	41.0	40.0	40.6	40.7	41.4	41.2	40.8
Miscellaneous manufacturing	39.0	38.9	39.0	39.3	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Nondurable goods	38.9	39.5	39.6	39.6	39.0	39.7	39.7	40.0	40.0	39.6
Overtime hours	2.6	3.1	3.1	3.1	2.7	3.1	3.2	3.2	3.3	3.2
Food and kindred products	38.8	39.4	39.2	39.3	39.2	39.5	39.4	39.6	39.6	39.7
Tobacco manufactures	36.3	38.1	36.2	37.4	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Textile mill products	39.7	40.3	40.6	40.4	39.6	40.7	40.7	41.1	41.9	40.3
Apparel and other textile products	35.7	36.1	36.7	36.7	35.6	36.4	36.5	37.3	37.1	36.[illegible]
Paper and allied products	42.0	43.1	42.9	42.6	42.1	43.0	43.0	43.2	43.3	42.7
Printing and publishing	37.5	37.5	37.6	37.9	37.4	37.9	37.6	37.9	37.9	37.7
Chemicals and allied products	41.2	42.0	42.0	41.9	41.2	41.8	41.9	42.2	42.2	41.9
Petroleum and coal products	44.0	44.1	43.5	44.7	44.9	43.6	44.7	45.1	44.6	45.[illegible]
Rubber and miscellaneous plastics products	40.6	42.0	42.1	41.7	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Leather and leather products	35.7	36.7	37.0	36.3	36.0	37.2	37.0	37.3	37.3	36.6
Transportation and public utilities	38.7	39.1	39.1	39.1	38.8	39.2	39.4	39.5	39.3	39.2
Wholesale trade	38.3	38.6	38.4	38.4	38.4	38.7	38.7	38.8	38.7	38.5
Retail trade	29.3	29.4	29.4	29.5	29.7	30.0	30.4	30.1	30.0	29.9
Finance, insurance, and real estate	36.0	36.6	36.3	36.2	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Services	32.6	32.6	32.6	32.6	32.7	32.7	32.6	32.8	32.7	32.7

[1] Data relate to production workers in mining and manufacturing; to construction workers in construction; and to nonsupervisory workers in transportation and public utilities; wholesale and retail trade; finance, insurance, and real estate; and services. These groups account for approximately four-fifths of the total employees on private nonagricultural payrolls.

[2] This series is not published seasonally adjusted since the seasonal component is small relative to the trend-cycle and/or irregular components and consequently cannot be separated with sufficient precision.

p = preliminary.

ESTABLISHMENT DATA

Table B-3. Average hourly and weekly earnings of production or nonsupervisory workers[1] on private nonagricultural payrolls by industry

Industry	Average hourly earnings				Average weekly earnings			
	Mar. 1983	Jan. 1984	Feb. 1984p	Mar. 1984p	Mar. 1983	Jan. 1984	Feb. 1984 p	Mar. 1984 p
Total private	8?.40	8?.26	8?.24	8?.24	$274.13	$289.10	$289.22	$288.40
Seasonally adjusted	7.91	8.23	8.??	8.25	275.27	292.17	291.34	290.40
Mining	11.19	11.56	11.48	11.56	487.74	501.70	495.94	493.6?
Construction	11.95	12.07	11.98	11.98	434.98	438.14	443.26	437.74
Manufacturing	8.74	9.09	9.08	9.11	346.10	369.05	369.56	369.87
Durable goods	9.29	9.66	9.66	9.68	372.53	398.96	399.92	399.78
Lumber and wood products	7.68	7.88	7.88	7.83	302.59	310.47	312.84	309.29
Furniture and fixtures	6.51	6.76	6.76	6.78	251.29	263.64	264.32	265.78
Stone, clay, and glass products	9.13	9.43	9.40	9.40	368.85	385.69	390.10	389.16
Primary metal industries	11.24	11.37	11.46	11.47	446.23	476.40	481.32	479.45
Blast furnaces and basic steel products	12.85	12.79	13.08	13.07	489.59	523.11	538.90	537.18
Fabricated metal products	9.05	9.34	9.34	9.34	361.10	386.08	387.61	386.88
Machinery, except electrical	9.46	9.92	9.94	9.95	378.40	414.66	417.48	416.91
Electrical and electronic equipment	8.60	8.89	8.86	8.87	344.00	366.27	366.15	364.56
Transportation equipment	11.49	12.08	12.??	12.16	480.28	518.?3	516.95	522.52
Motor vehicles and equipment	11.89	12.55	12.46	12.73	505.33	555.97	548.24	566.49
Instruments and related products	8.47	8.74	8.71	8.75	340.49	359.21	357.64	358.75
Miscellaneous manufacturing	6.75	7.03	6.99	6.99	263.25	273.47	276.30	274.71
Nondurable goods	8.00	8.27	8.24	8.27	311.20	326.67	326.30	327.49
Food and kindred products	8.16	8.38	8.35	8.37	316.61	330.17	327.32	324.94
Tobacco manufactures	10.43	10.74	11.10	11.28	378.61	409.19	401.82	421.87
Textile mill products	6.11	6.41	6.42	6.42	242.57	257.92	260.63	259.37
Apparel and other textile products	5.33	5.51	5.46	5.50	190.28	198.91	200.38	201.85
Paper and allied products	9.67	10.22	10.21	10.25	406.14	440.48	438.21	438.65
Printing and publishing	9.03	9.28	9.30	9.30	338.63	348.00	349.88	342.47
Chemicals and allied products	10.39	10.90	10.89	10.80	428.07	457.80	457.38	456.29
Petroleum and coal products	13.28	13.47	13.43	13.56	584.32	594.03	584.21	589.35
Rubber and miscellaneous plastics products	7.92	8.20	8.19	8.19	321.55	344.40	344.80	341.52
Leather and leather products	5.52	5.67	5.67	5.67	197.06	238.09	209.79	2?5.82
Transportation and public utilities	10.68	11.04	11.01	11.00	413.32	432.06	430.49	430.10
Wholesale trade	8.27	8.60	8.65	8.64	316.74	335.45	332.16	331.78
Retail trade	5.68	5.89	5.88	5.89	166.42	173.17	173.17	173.76
Finance, insurance, and real estate	7.19	7.55	7.53	7.52	258.84	270.33	273.34	272.2?
Services	7.17	7.54	7.52	7.51	233.74	245.80	245.15	244.8?

[1] See footnote 1, table B-2.

p = preliminary.

Table B-4. Hourly Earnings Index for production or nonsupervisory workers[1] on private nonagricultural payrolls by industry

(1977 = 100)

Industry	Not seasonally adjusted					Seasonally adjusted						
	Mar. 1983	Jan. 1984	Feb. 1984p	Mar. 1984p	Percent change from: Mar. 1983-Mar. 1984	Mar. 1983	Nov. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984	Feb. 1984p	Mar. 1984p	Percent change from: Feb. 1984-Mar. 1984
Total private nonfarm:												
Current dollars	153.3	158.9	158.6	158.6	3.4	153.6	156.9	157.6	158.3	158.2	158.7	0.3
Constant (1977) dollars	95.0	93.3	94.9	N.A.	(2)	94.9	94.4	94.7	94.7	94.6	N.A.	(3)
Mining	164.0	171.4	170.6	170.9	4.2	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)
Construction	144.2	146.3	145.2	145.1	.6	145.5	144.6	145.2	146.2	146.1	146.4	.2
Manufacturing	156.9	161.1	161.1	161.5	2.9	157.1	159.7	160.1	160.7	161.1	161.7	.4
Transportation and public utilities	155.0	160.7	160.2	160.0	3.2	155.9	158.7	158.9	160.0	159.6	160.9	.8
Wholesale and retail trade	149.9	155.7	155.6	155.9	3.8	149.6	154.1	154.8	155.2	155.1	155.3	.1
Finance, insurance, and real estate	156.7	164.5	164.0	164.0	4.7	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)
Services	153.2	161.1	160.4	160.4	4.7	152.6	158.1	159.2	159.8	159.3	159.7	.3

1 See footnote 1, table B-2.
2 Percent change is -.06 from February 1983 to February 1984, the latest month available.
3 Percent change is -.02 percent from January 1984 to February 1984, the latest month available.
4 These series are not seasonally adjusted since the seasonal component is small relative to the trend-cycle and/or irregular components and consequently cannot be separated with sufficient precision.
N.A. = not available.
p = preliminary.

ESTABLISHMENT DATA

Table B-5. Indexes of aggregate weekly hours of production or nonsupervisory workers[1] on private nonagricultural payrolls by industry

(1977 = 100)

Industry	Not seasonally adjusted				Seasonally adjusted					
	Mar. 1983	Jan. 1984	Feb. 1984 p	Mar. 1984 p	Mar. 1983	Nov. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984	Feb. 1984 p	Mar. 1984 p
Total	101.2	106.5	106.9	107.7	103.1	108.3	108.9	110.3	110.4	109.8
Goods-producing	95.9	94.5	95.6	96.3	97.8	96.3	96.8	99.5	100.1	98.4
Mining	108.9	120.1	118.9	118.7	110.7	118.1	118.9	122.2	121.5	119.8
Construction	94.7	94.2	95.7	96.4	94.3	105.2	105.6	112.6	114.1	107.6
Manufacturing	95.0	93.4	94.5	95.3	99.4	93.5	94.0	95.6	96.4	95.6
Durable goods	91.8	92.5	93.9	94.9	91.6	91.9	92.6	94.7	95.6	94.6
Lumber and wood products	82.2	92.4	93.8	95.1	85.1	97.0	97.2	100.0	99.2	98.4
Furniture and fixtures	98.2	99.7	101.3	101.8	97.9	100.1	101.7	103.0	102.8	102.5
Stone, clay, and glass products	79.0	83.4	82.6	84.7	78.1	86.1	85.5	87.2	89.7	87.0
Primary metal industries	63.3	72.6	73.4	74.0	67.2	72.1	73.4	72.7	73.7	72.8
Blast furnaces and basic steel products	53.9	60.4	61.2	61.8	52.5	60.7	61.9	60.8	60.7	60.7
Fabricated metal products	79.6	89.2	90.0	90.7	79.4	88.5	89.4	91.0	91.6	90.6
Machinery, except electrical	80.1	92.8	94.7	95.9	78.7	90.0	91.0	92.9	94.3	94.1
Electrical and electronic equipment	95.4	109.7	110.9	112.3	95.2	108.0	108.7	110.7	111.9	111.8
Transportation equipment	81.8	94.6	96.4	97.3	81.0	92.0	92.5	97.4	98.1	96.2
Motor vehicles and equipment	71.1	86.9	91.5	94.1	71.7	85.4	86.1	95.3	93.9	94.7
Instruments and related products	101.0	106.0	106.1	106.6	100.6	105.1	104.8	107.1	106.9	106.4
Miscellaneous manufacturing	79.9	82.4	83.6	86.3	80.7	85.4	87.2	87.3	88.8	87.0
Nondurable goods	99.7	94.7	95.4	95.8	91.0	95.8	96.1	97.0	97.7	97.1
Food and kindred products	98.8	92.4	91.2	91.5	94.1	95.9	95.6	97.1	97.1	97.1
Tobacco manufactures	82.0	85.0	76.2	78.5	89.6	83.4	82.8	83.1	78.9	85.0
Textile mill products	77.5	82.8	83.4	83.4	77.6	83.5	83.7	85.3	84.5	83.7
Apparel and other textile products	85.9	92.4	92.9	94.2	85.5	92.1	92.9	95.9	95.1	93.8
Paper and allied products	91.4	97.0	96.9	96.9	92.1	96.6	97.4	98.0	98.6	98.5
Printing and publishing	107.2	111.1	111.9	113.4	106.5	111.8	112.9	112.4	112.4	112.3
Chemicals and allied products	93.9	96.5	96.9	97.1	93.7	96.2	96.8	97.7	97.4	97.0
Petroleum and coal products	92.9	85.5	84.1	88.2	97.6	89.4	90.8	90.0	89.6	92.2
Rubber and miscellaneous plastics products	94.6	109.8	111.9	112.4	94.9	108.0	109.6	111.7	113.2	112.6
Leather and leather products	78.1	81.1	82.7	79.8	79.9	84.4	83.5	84.7	84.1	81.7
Service-producing	109.7	113.1	113.2	114.1	111.6	114.9	115.6	116.0	116.1	116.1
Transportation and public utilities	97.7	100.2	100.3	100.5	99.1	101.1	101.7	102.7	102.2	102.1
Wholesale trade	105.2	109.2	109.1	109.7	106.1	109.6	109.9	111.0	110.4	110.6
Retail trade	98.8	102.5	101.1	101.9	103.0	105.7	107.3	106.5	106.5	106.1
Finance, insurance, and real estate	115.9	127.6	120.0	120.7	116.4	119.8	120.5	121.9	121.4	120.8
Services	123.1	126.1	127.8	129.2	123.9	128.2	128.3	129.1	129.7	130.3

[1] See footnote 1, table B-2.

p = preliminary.

Table B-6. Indexes of diffusion: Percent of industries in which employment[1] increased

Time span	Year	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.
Over 1-month span	1982	28.5	43.4	36.0	39.0	47.6	32.8	38.4	37.1	34.1	29.3	32.0	42.2
	1983	56.5	45.7	62.4	69.1	71.0	64.5	68.5	68.0	60.8	70.7	64.5	64.0
	1984	66.9	69.4p	65.1p									
Over 3-month span	1982	25.3	28.8	32.0	34.1	32.5	33.6	27.2	27.2	26.1	25.5	24.7	40.6
	1983	45.4	55.1	65.6	75.8	76.1	77.2	73.9	79.6	79.6	74.2	72.0	75.0
	1984	79.3p	79.3p										
Over 6-month span	1982	20.2	23.7	23.3	29.8	26.1	26.1	23.4	19.1	21.2	26.1	26.6	35.8
	1983	30.5	63.2	73.4	76.3	79.3	83.6	82.5	80.4	82.0	84.1	82.8p	82.3p
	1984												
Over 12-month span	1982	22.0	20.7	18.0	19.4	18.3	20.7	20.7	22.8	24.2	31.5	37.6	44.1
	1983	48.9	58.3	62.6	73.4	76.1	81.2	84.4	87.9p	86.0p			
	1984												

[1] Number of employees, seasonally adjusted for 1, 3, and 6 month spans, on payrolls of 186 private nonagricultural industries.

p = preliminary.

NOTE: Figures are the percent of industries with employment rising. (Half of the unchanged components are counted as rising.) Data are centered within the spans.

Representative LUNGREN. Thank you, Ms. Norwood.

In previous months you've used terms to describe the recovery in employment such as robust and widespread. I take it from what you've said, this trend is continuing?

Ms. NORWOOD. The improvement in the labor market has been extraordinarily vigorous. The month of March has been less brisk, but there is still growth and it is, as you commented, quite widespread, though the gains are smaller than they have been.

Representative LUNGREN. I understand that these data reflect labor market conditions for the week of March 12 and sometimes you hear arguments that weather affects that or weather doesn't affect it. As I understand it, we had some pretty bad weather in certain parts of the country, the Central and Southern parts of the country.

Would that or does that in any way affect the data that we are looking at now?

Ms. NORWOOD. Well, of course, we try, Congressman, to make allowances for that through the whole seasonal adjustment process, but if you have a year when the bad weather is in a different week than it has been in the preceding years, that becomes increasingly difficult. I think the decline in construction employment is probably perhaps somewhat exaggerated because of the bad weather and the problem of seasonal adjustment.

Representative LUNGREN. Does it have any effect on average hours worked?

Ms. NORWOOD. It could. It certainly could. As I suggested in my statement, however, one of the things we have to understand is that we had month after month of extraordinarily vigorous job growth. We have seen job increases I think now for many months. We are looking at a month, the month of March, when we would expect an increase in hours. The seasonal adjustment process would have provided for that. Before seasonal adjustment there was really no decline in hours and the hours that are worked are relatively high by historical standards. And, therefore, it seems to me that we need, in understanding this single month's drop, to take into account the prior employment growth in the last few months which might have made employers less anxious to increase their hours. So that it's not completely unexpected.

Representative LUNGREN. That was one of the questions I wanted to ask. I couldn't be here at last month's hearing but when I saw the figures I was surprised at the large amount of job growth that we saw in February, and I believe your statement indicated that as well.

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes.

Representative LUNGREN. Most commentators were extremely surprised, and I wonder if the fact of that rather extraordinary increase that we saw in February should be taken into account when we look at the hours worked and the drop in overtime hours that we see reflected in this month's statistics.

Ms. NORWOOD. I think it must have had some effect. Exactly how much effect it will take several months of data to know.

Representative LUNGREN. Ms. Norwood, in your testimony, I believe you referred to a large employment gain in machinery manufacturing; it that true?

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes.

Representative LUNGREN. Is that a new feature of the recovery? Have we seen that? Maybe it's just that I don't recall you mentioning it in the past, but is that something that is finally coming onboard or is it something we have seen all along?

Ms. NORWOOD. I think you're quite right that it's something that's beginning to come onboard now. The machinery industry was not one of those with job increases in the early stages of the recovery. It is now certainly beginning to show signs of employment change.

Representative LUNGREN. Is that something we should expect at this stage in the recovery when you look back at others, or is that something that occurs at different times in different recoveries? Is it a guidepost that you look for during recoveries?

Ms. NORWOOD. Machinery is always slow in coming back and it is not surprising that it took a while even in this very vigorous recovery.

Representative LUNGREN. Let me ask you a question about the employment-population ratio. I've tried to look at this thing all the way through. I recall a number of months ago when we were discussing it and we went through the fact that in the trough of the recession in November–December of the previous year it was about 57.2. It's now up to 59.2 which matches the July 1981 employment-population ratio.

Can you tell us why that is, if it is in fact an important factor for us to take a look at, and what does it really mean?

Ms. NORWOOD. Well, the employment-population ratio is an extraordinarily important figure because it tells us the proportion of the population of working age who actually have jobs. We always have people who are not looking for jobs and who are not working who therefore are not in the labor force and are not included in the unemployment numbers. So in order to be sure to get a really complete picture we need to look both at the employment-population ratio and at the unemployment rates.

This is particularly important, I think, for those groups of the labor force which have such a difficult time, the minority population, who tend to get discouraged and therefore drop out of the labor force entirely. You can see what's happening to them better by looking at the employment-population ratio.

But this ratio is high. It's high by historical standards. It is, however, of course, below the all-time high of 1979.

Representative LUNGREN. I think that was 60.1. The thing that still intrigues me about this is as we're gotten back to this level of 59.2, if you compare it to previous periods of time—let's say 5 years back or so—you have that relatively high employment-population ratio and yet our corresponding unemployment rate is higher than it was in previous years when we had a similar employment-population ratio, which suggests to me that we have a little different dynamics than we've had before and that perhaps those of us who are policymakers have to look and understand what those dynamics are and, as you and I have discussed before, part of that is the higher participation of women in the work force than we had in previous years.

Ms. NORWOOD. Right.

Representative LUNGREN. Senator Proxmire.

Senator PROXMIRE. Allen Sinai, who is the chief economist at Lehman Brothers, recently asked, "Why has the economy been so strong?" The answer is straightforward. The huge fiscal stimulus of Reaganomics. Approximately $650 billion in personal and business tax cuts for 1981 to 1986 and $250 billion increase in military spending. Their effects have far more than offset the drag of high interest rates and any reduction in nondefense spending.

Do you agree with the view, Ms. Norwood, that Federal deficit spending accounts for much of the strength in the economy?

Ms. NORWOOD. Well, I'm sure there have been a number of factors which are responsible for this. It's quite clear that there has been a considerable increase in employment in some of the defense industries too.

Senator PROXMIRE. Well, not only that, but when you run the kind of colossal deficits that we've run—after all, we've never had a deficit anything like the deficit we've had in the last few years—$109 billion in 1982 and $195 billion last year, and we're running a deficit now at a rate of about $180 billion. That's spectacular, even with respect to our present gross national product. It's bigger than we've ever had in peacetime and it would seem to me that this has to be accountable in part for the strength of the recovery.

The reason I asked that is since unemployment did not change much in March—there may be reasons for that, but it didn't—the recovery maybe leveling off, I wonder if we do have leeway for cutting spending and increasing revenues without halting the economic growth we have and without stopping the drop in unemployment that we'd like to see continue?

Ms. NORWOOD. Well, I'm sure that you especially, Senator Proxmire, recognize that we can't read too much into a single month of numbers. It is true that this employment growth is slower than it has been, but there is still growth. And I think that at this stage of a recovery it is to the employment growth that we need to be very watchful. It is also historical experience. It is really very rare that you have a continuing, uninterrupted change in the unemployment rate. So the fact that the unemployment rate holds steady or even might go up a tick and then down is something that I think cannot be looked at, at least in a single month, as establishing any kind of trend.

Senator PROXMIRE. Well let me see if I can get a little clearer impression of your notion of the effect of deficit spending on the economy.

Supposing I try to put a number on it. Would you deny the likelihood that at least two-thirds of the recovery has been because of enormous deficit spending and a huge deficit?

Ms. NORWOOD. I really don't know, Senator Proxmire. I have read a good deal of the public discussion on that issue. Many of our European friends have discussed it as well, and I just think that I will have to leave those judgments to you.

Senator PROXMIRE. All right. Well, just let me say that from my own experience I'm old enough to remember very vividly what happened in World War II when we ran a fantastic deficit, much bigger than it is now because it was wartime. This is the biggest peacetime deficit, but the wartime deficit was three times as big in

relation to the gross national product, and the unemployment dropped down from about 14 percent in 1940 to 2 percent because we were spending an enormous amount because of the war effort and we didn't raise taxes and the result was, of course, that we had a very great drop in unemployment and enormous economic growth, the most spectacular growth we've ever had.

This isn't nearly at that level but nevertheless it seems to me it tends to have that effect.

In the March 26 Wall Street Journal, Alfred Malabre, Jr., points out that although the Consumer and Producer Price Indexes both rose less rapidly in February than in January, several signs point to faster inflation ahead. No. 1, the prices of industrial raw materials have risen sharply since early February. These increases will begin to show up in the more familiar price indexes in about 6 months.

No. 2, factory utilization is now at 81 percent of capacity, a level at which the inflation rate has accelerated in recent years.

No. 3, something that Chairman Lungren and you have discussed, the unemployment rate is still high by historical standards but the ratio of employment to the working age population is near the all-time high reached in 1979.

I noticed in your A–1 table here you show that if you take the men 16 years old and older, for example, the employment-population ratio is at 71 percent and for women it's 49.1 percent, and those are both, as you indicated, high by historic standards, if not at the absolutely top level. And Malabre comments that some analysts regard this as the most meaningful measure of labor availability.

How would you or the inflation experts who are with you at the table react to the assertion of Mr. Malabre that we may be at a critical level at which prices may begin to rise?

Ms. NORWOOD. Well, there has been a good deal of discussion about whether there is a heating up of inflation. We don't see any specific signs of that yet, apart from the anticipated increases in food prices much of which we have already had but some of it which will flow through some of our food items—particularly beef and veal and some of the other food items. Much of that, of course, is weather related and there isn't a lot that can be done about it.

It is true that capacity utilization is higher now than it had been, but it had been extraordinarily low, and the fact that factory utilization is in the 80-percent range or somewhat above that it seems to me does not by itself mean that we are going to have increased inflation.

Senator PROXMIRE. Doesn't it mean in some areas, though, that because you're close to capacity in some areas—papermaking for instance at 95 percent of capacity—and we're moving up rapidly in automobiles and so forth, that business may feel free to raise prices because it's the only way thay can meet the demand and it may be necessary for them to do that in order to justify bringing in less efficient capacity, third shifts and so forth?

Ms. NORWOOD. Of course, it's entirely possible that employers may make decisions about their pricing. In fact, a review of the price data all through the recession shows that at times employers

and managers of enterprises have raised prices when people would least have expected that.

So I think we have to recognize that that may occur, but Mr. Malabre mentioned two other things. One was the drop in raw materials prices. Our work has not shown that there is a direct timely relationship between the prices of crude materials and the prices of finished goods. This is due, in part I think, because of the volatility of those data and the inability to measure them with as great accuracy as some of the other data that we have.

Senator PROXMIRE. How about the area where you're particularly expert. Representative Lungren has pointed out that we are within about 1 percent of the highest level we've ever been at in employment-population ratio. As he pointed out, and I think he's correct, 60.5 percent is the highest it's ever been and it's now at 59.6.

Do you regard this as a real measure of the pressure on the available labor supply that might result in higher wages which in turn could result in higher prices?

Ms. NORWOOD. I don't see that as upward pressure at this point. If you look at the various groups of the labor force, you will see, for example, that for adult men the employment-population ratio while high is still considerably below the levels that it was at in many, many previous years. It's at 73 percent now and all through the 1960's and 1950's had been 80 percent or more. So I think there's still some room.

Senator PROXMIRE. I'm sorry. I missed that.

Ms. NORWOOD. I said that what you need to do is to break the employment-population ratio down by particular group of the population and if you look at adult men in the labor force, their employment-population ratio is 73 percent. That is a relatively high number, but all through the 1950's and 1960's that employment-population ratio was in the eighties.

Senator PROXMIRE. Well, my time is up. I think that's an excellent point. The fact is, we do have far more women in the work force than we have had, although some people feel we may be coming to a limit on that.

Representative LUNGREN. Ms. Norwood, to follow up on that, last month you noted that the employment-population ratio for women was, I believe, at a record 49.6 percent and evidently it remains high this month. Maybe I'm wrong, but could that be interpreted as a sign that the economy is overheating? I mean, we really don't have a historical background to go on, do we? The participation of women has continued to go up. And can you use that as an interpretation that the economy is overheating?

Ms. NORWOOD. Well, I wouldn't.

Representative LUNGREN. Is there any historical basis for doing that when you recognize this is a relatively new and continuing phenomenon?

Ms. NORWOOD. The problem really is, Congressman, that you can't take these numbers in isolation. One needs to look behind them to find out why people are operating as they are. Women are coming into the labor force because they want to be there and they are staying there because in part they want those jobs, because of the standard of living of many American families today has been oriented to depend upon two incomes. Other women, of course, are

wholly responsible for the financial support of themselves and their families. So I think there are a lot of reasons for it.

The question I think for the inflation issue is basically are we getting to the point where there are bottlenecks and shortages? I haven't seen very much evidence of that. I'm sure that in a particular situation and a particular area that may be true, but given the breadth of this country and the number of different kinds of industries we have, the number of occupations that we have, overall I don't see evidence that there is a tremendous bottleneck or shortage of employees.

Representative LUNGREN. That's an interesting comment because when I go home and talk to people who are in small- and medium-size businesses they say, "How can you folks in Washington be talking about overheating? We're just beginning to see the recovery affecting our particular industry or our particular companies." And obviously everyone looks from their own perspective, but it's kind of a tough question to answer.

Ms. NORWOOD. We still have a significant number of people who are unemployed and it's hard for me to think of this as kind of an overheated situation without those people working.

Representative LUNGREN. When we were talking a minute ago about the prospects for inflation, Senator Proxmire mentioned the auto industry. It seems to me those of us in Congress have something to do with some of the problems there. I think—because of the concern that we were going to mandate it in the Congress—the administration required Japan to have a restraint on the number of autos in this country. As a result, if we look at the average price of a Japanese auto it's gone up and profits have gone up for the Japanese manufacturers and the dealers. I've got dealers in my area telling me, "Look, we're making a whole lot more money selling less cars and if that's what you folks want us to do we'll do it, but it's not good for the economy." So sometimes we create those situations ourselves.

Unfortunately, I didn't bring along my quotes from the supply side economists about why they think we're in a recovery, so I will just have to rely on my own feeling that it isn't necessarily due primarily to the deficit spending, but since the Senator referred to it, I'd just like to ask you this.

During the past 16 months under the Reagan administration, employment has increased evidently by your figures by about 5.1 million. How does this compare to employment growth during the first 16 months of our previous postwar recovery?

Ms. NORWOOD. It's higher. The household survey figures which you were quoting really show quite extraordinary growth and that is considerably higher than in any other postwar period by well over a million more than in 1975–76. The establishment survey shows 3.7 million change, and that is relatively high too.

Representative LUNGREN. Let me ask you another question then. In 1983, real average weekly earnings rose by 2 percent after I believe 4 consecutive years of decline. Has this trend continued in 1984, real average weekly earnings?

Ms. NORWOOD. Overall, it has. In individual months, it has bounced around and it did decline some.

Representative LUNGREN. The overall trend, though, continued?

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes.

Representative LUNGREN. Can you tell us what happened to the number of long-term unemployed during the first quarter of 1984? I know we've discussed that before and you've indicated that at certain points in the recovery you expect to see that change. Where are we now?

Ms. NORWOOD. Long-term unemployed declined by about 50,000 in the month of March and we now have about 1.8 million.

Representative LUNGREN. Is that drop to be expected at this point in the recovery?

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes. It takes a while for the long-term unemployed to find jobs and so at the early stages of the recovery that number stays pretty high. As you move into a recovery you would expect and hope, certainly, that that very important group begins to decline, and I think we are seeing some of that.

Representative LUNGREN. In some of the past hearings you've given us some information with respect to U.S. comparisons on unemployment and employment growth vis-a-vis Europe and some other areas.

How does the United States compare to Europe with respect to typical duration of unemployment? Is it substantially the same or are we unique in terms of our typical duration of unemployment?

Ms. NORWOOD. European countries tend generally to have much longer duration. That is for a particular individual. A particular individual suffers unemployment for a very much longer time. In fact, in the United Kingdom, the period is extremely, extraordinarily long.

In the United States, on the other hand, there is a great deal more turnover among the unemployed.

Representative LUNGREN. Is there a particular reason for that, that we are so different compared to Great Britain?

Ms. NORWOOD. I think it is in large part because of the dynamic nature of our labor market. People have in general always assumed that they might resign to look for a better job or that if they lost their job they would be able to find another one and so continue to look for one, and we have also had quite a history of job creation in this country.

Representative LUNGREN. That brings up the question of the discouraged work force, which you estimate on a quarterly basis. I know you always caution us that being a discouraged worker is a state of mind. What happened to the number of discouraged workers during the first quarter of 1984 and what has been the trend over the past year?

Ms. NORWOOD. The number of discouraged workers is down considerably since the end of last year. It's now at about 1.3 million. In the fourth quarter, it was about 1.5 million, and it was almost 1.8 million in the first quarter of 1983. So it's down considerably.

Representative LUNGREN. What is the importance of the discouraged worker data? I know you've cautioned us before that it's a state of mind and it's difficult to determine, but what is the significance of that data for those of us in policy positions?

Ms. NORWOOD. I think it's an important set of data, although you're right that I think we need to look at them with some caution. Nevertheless, they are extremely important because they are

people who are not counted in the unemployment rate and they are not counted because they are out of the labor force.

As the economy recovers, we would expect more people to be drawn into the labor force and we would expect that the number of discouraged would decline, and I think we are seeing some of that.

Representative LUNGREN. According to BLS, the Consumer Price Index rose only four-tenths of 1 percent in February, which I believe is the latest statistics we have. I would view that as a very positive figure saying that the current administration has come a long way in battling inflation. There are some who look at that and say you've really got to analyze it because it affects groups differently.

What does the BLS research tell us about the inflation rates faced by different population groups? For instance, do blacks and whites, rich and poor, face different inflation rates because of different expenditure patterns?

Ms. NORWOOD. People who have different expenditure patterns obviously face somewhat different rates of inflation. Our Consumer Price Indexes measure the inflation experience of only the two major groups—the total or overall urban population and the wage earner clerical worker population. There are really very few differences overall when you look at the overall numbers between those two population groups.

It is, in our view, very difficult to determine the actual price experience of other groups of the population merely by looking at their expenditure patterns. That's one way of doing it, but we believe that our experience in price measurement suggests that just as important, perhaps even more important, than the expenditure patterns are the places in which people live and the places in which they shop. And we do not have any specific data—we have not collected data to represent the kinds of places in which other groups of the population are shopping. So it's very hard for us to tell much about that.

Representative LUNGREN. Let me just ask one last question on that. The Consumer Price Index, is that weighted in such a way that it more accurately reflects price fluctuations in what we would refer to as essentials as opposed to what might be referred to as luxury items, or is it made up in such a way that it's more across the board? By that, I mean I would think essentials would be the essentials of living, food costs, housing costs, perhaps transportation costs, as opposed to certain other luxury-type things.

Ms. NORWOOD. No, Congressman. The Consumer Price Index Program is based upon objective surveys of how people are actually spending their money. We at the Bureau of Labor Statistics would not like to have to decide what is a luxury, even in a food item, since people have different tastes and it might be a very difficult thing to do. So we have found that the best way to do this is to survey the population of the country and find out what they are spending their money on and then use an objective sampling procedure to select the items from that total universe.

Representative LUNGREN. Thank you.

Senator Proxmire.

Senator PROXMIRE. I notice that the recovery, as far as unemployment is concerned, is reported in your data here to be quite

uneven. For example, in Florida, there was a sharp drop in unemployment. Of course, Florida had low unemployment anyway. Massachusetts went down to 5.3 percent which is a remarkably good record. But then you have Illinois which had high unemployment to begin with, it went from 9.5 to 10.5. And Ohio from 9.3 to 10.2. Both those latter States were suffering very serious unemployment and they seem to be really bogged down in the depth of a recession.

This suggests to me that we may have the phenomenon of still fairly high national unemployment, but pressures in some States like Massachusetts and elsewhere on labor resources so that you get both some inflation and still high unemployment. Is that right?

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes, that is correct. I think it is interesting to note, Senator Proxmire, however, that the table with the State data on it suggests that many States had declines in unemployment this month.

Representative LUNGREN. Well, I think that's true. And you say you don't have data on these individual States except for the big ones for March, do you?

Ms. NORWOOD. That's correct.

Senator PROXMIRE. So we can't make that conclusion, as of this month, but I think you're right over the trend over the long period.

One reason for the large drop in the unemployment rate in a recovery is the slow growth in the labor force. How much has the labor force grown in this recovery and how does this compare with the previous two recoveries? There's been some growth, but compared to what we have experienced historically it's been quite slow; isn't that right?

Ms. NORWOOD. It has been slow. It seems to be picking up in the last several months, however. It's about 2 million over the year and is, in fact, 2 million since November 1982.

Senator PROXMIRE. But as a percentage? Do we not have now 104 million people employed in this country?

Ms. NORWOOD. About that.

Senator PROXMIRE. So that's only about a 2-percent improvement in the period of recovery in the work force.

Ms. NORWOOD. In terms of percentage increases, the labor force since November 1982 has increased much more slowly than in the same periods after the 1970–72 period and after the 1975–76 period, and even the 1954–55 period, but there have been three recession recovery periods when there was in fact slower labor force growth. I think we are beginning to see a little pickup in labor force growth now.

Senator PROXMIRE. Last month the mean duration of unemployment was unchanged at 18.8 weeks. Congressman Lungren spoke about that in comparison with the European situation. I'd like to speak about it in comparison with our own historical experience here in the United States of America.

In fact, isn't this still high by historic standards, the duration of unemployment, in fact, higher than occurred in any month prior to 1983?

Ms. NORWOOD. I believe so.

Senator PROXMIRE. Is this high for this stage of the recovery?

Ms. NORWOOD. I would expect that it would be in part because this recession was longer and deeper than other recessions.

Senator PROXMIRE. Now, last month the unemployment rate for black workers rose to 16.6 percent, while the white rate was unchanged at 6.7 percent. I'm talking about adults. So the black rate was 2½ times the white rate. Isn't that ratio higher than in the past?

Ms. NORWOOD. The ratio has hovered between 2 and 2½ percent for a very long time.

Senator PROXMIRE. In view of all the efforts we've made or we think we've made, they haven't been very effective—through affirmative action and so forth, trying to prevent discrimination against blacks in employment—what is the cause of this continued very, very high rate? Also 2½ times is certainly an indication of failure on our part to open up opportunities to blacks to work.

Ms. NORWOOD. It's quite clear that our black population has a very difficult time in the labor market. It's also clear that their high rates of unemployment in the early 1980 period have generally continued. Black men in particular have enjoyed a considerable amount of the benefits from the current recovery. They have had quite considerable increase in their employment during the last 16 or 17 months.

Senator PROXMIRE. That wasn't true last month, however.

Ms. NORWOOD. No, but that's 1 month.

Senator PROXMIRE. Last month they suffered.

Ms. NORWOOD. That's 1 month of data, Senator Proxmire, and I'd like to wait for another month or two to see whether there is a trend.

Now, having said that, I'd like to emphasize that I think the unemployment conditions of our black population are very serious indeed. There's no question about that.

Senator PROXMIRE. And you say the cause of this is they just had trouble in the past or can we put our finger on a more precise cause? Is it because they traditionally have worked in manufacturing and heavy industry which has suffered more, or is there some other reason?

Ms. NORWOOD. Well, I think there are a whole variety of problems. One question is location. You mentioned before that there was some considerable difference among the various States, and there is. We have pockets of very high unemployment in some parts of the country and we have pockets of very, very low unemployment in others.

Senator PROXMIRE. But it's hard to see when you compare those States that the black population is higher in the States that have higher unemployment. For instance, in Texas it's low, and generally in the Southwest it's been fairly low and in the South generally it's been low, and the black population is higher in the South. So that low unemployment there should have benefited the black population rather than giving us the situation we have where it's just about as bad as it's been in the past or worse.

Ms. NORWOOD. That is true except for the industrial composition which is the other point. Part of it is their location, even within the State and within the city. The minority population may just not be where the jobs are.

Of course, you mentioned Texas and we have the Mexican border area where unemployment rates are very, very high and are in the

double-digit range even though for the State of Texas as a whole the unemployment rates are fairly moderate.

In addition, there are questions of education and training, as with any group of the unemployed, but many particularly of our black youth population have been living in circumstances that have not been particularly conductive to educational attainment.

Senator PROXMIRE. At the beginning of your appearance here I mentioned the fact that the average weekly hours had dropped. They are now 35.2 for overall total private, and manufacturing dropped from 41 to 40.5 and the manufacturing overtime has dropped.

Aren't those indications of a diminishing demand for labor, hard clear factual indications of that?

Ms. NORWOOD. Taken by themselves, that's correct. However, when you look at the hours in relation to the employment growth that has occurred over the last several months, I would be more wary of drawing that conclusion.

Senator PROXMIRE. Well, they are lower than they were in the fourth quarter of 1983, total private hours, and so in a recovery it seems to me that suggests that we may be reaching the end of a drop in unemployment. I hope not, but it suggests it.

Now today you reported—Congressman Lungren discussed this to some extent and I'd like to follow up—today you reported that in the first quarter of 1984 there were 1.3 million discouraged workers and you used that figure in response to Congressman Lungren. That is those persons who would like to have a job but have given up looking for one.

How does that compare with data for recent years and with situations in similar times in previous economic recoveries?

Ms. NORWOOD. We don't have those data with us, but we would be glad to supply them for the record.

Senator PROXMIRE. Can you give it to me off the top of your head as an expert? Doesn't that seem high?

Ms. NORWOOD. It's high.

Senator PROXMIRE. All right. Since the depth of the recession of November 1982, the teenage labor force had actually shrunk by 5 percent. At comparable stages in the previous five recoveries the teenage labor force rose by an average of more than 5 percent. This time it went down.

Why is this recovery so different? Are there fewer teenagers or fewer of them seeking work?

Ms. NORWOOD. It's largely that there are fewer teenagers because we have passed through the baby boom generation. There's also some very slight decline in their labor force participation rates, however, and that may be because of other activity, greater educational attainment, it's hard to tell.

Senator PROXMIRE. And that's different from the other five recoveries?

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes, clearly.

Senator PROXMIRE. Can you elaborate on that a little bit? Why is it different?

Ms. NORWOOD. Well, I think the major point that I would make that is different is that there are fewer people who are young because there were fewer of them born.

Senator PROXMIRE. Well, you made that point. You said in addition——

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes. I think that's the major point.

Senator PROXMIRE. Can you give us the actual figures? How many fewer are there? I had the understanding—apparently it was wrong—that the demographics were that there were fewer people between the ages of 5 and 15, but for the 16, 17, and 18 it hadn't quite hit that group.

Ms. NORWOOD. Well, I think it depends upon the period you're looking at, Senator Proxmire. Over this last year, for example, we had a decline of roughly 150,000 teenagers in the labor force. In the late 1960's and the 1970's, we used to have an increase of four or five hundred thousand coming into the labor force. So it's just a complete reversal.

Senator PROXMIRE. I'm not talking about coming into the labor force. I'm talking about the actual number there are.

Ms. NORWOOD. In the population?

Senator PROXMIRE. In the population, yes.

Ms. NORWOOD. Mr. Plewes.

Mr. PLEWES. We don't have the full historical series, Senator, but over the past year, for example, we have lost almost 600,000 in the population count of 16 to 19 year olds.

Senator PROXMIRE. You say we have lost 600,000 16- to 19-year-olds?

Mr. PLEWES. That's correct.

Senator PROXMIRE. And about what percentage drop is that?

Mr. PLEWES. It is out of a total of 15 million, so about 4 percent.

Senator PROXMIRE. About 4 or 5 percent?

Mr. PLEWES. Yes.

Senator PROXMIRE. Very good. I didn't have that figure. Thank you.

Thank you, Congressman.

Representative LUNGREN. Senator, I just want to say as a member of the postwar baby boom, it makes me even feel older to understand that we are just about past our peak for the crescendo entrance into the labor market.

Ms. Norwood, to try and follow up a little bit on the problem of youth unemployment, as you know, the administration may propose the adoption of a lower minimum wage for youth during the summer months. It's something that I've been advocating for some time, although it's somewhat controversial.

Does the nonseasonally adjusted youth unemployment tend to rise significantly during the summer months?

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes. There are always more than 1 million young people who come onto the labor market in May, June, and July.

Representative LUNGREN. I would assume this is a problem that affects the black teenagers certainly as much and I guess the statistics show more than white teenagers?

Ms. NORWOOD. That's correct.

Representative LUNGREN. As the Senator suggested, it's a problem that's been with us for a long period of time. Blacks face 2 to 2½ times the unemployment rate of whites, with black teenagers significantly higher. Maybe we need to try some new things which

some have considered daring and controversial to see if we might be able to affect that.

Ms. Norwood, women have traditionally been viewed as being segregated into a few low-paying occupations. Can you tell us whether the occupational segregation lessened or increased during the 1970's?

Ms. NORWOOD. There have been some dramatic improvements in some occupations but those dramatic improvements have been rather large percentage changes taken from very small bases and so the overall situation, the median or the mean for all women continues to show women segregated in both low-paying occupations and low-paying industries.

Representative LUNGREN. In your comments today you mentioned the diffusion index was important for us to consider. Could you just tell us why? I believe you said it was a significant indication that this recovery from the employment standpoint is rather widespread. How do we reach that conclusion from the data you have on the diffusion index?

Ms. NORWOOD. Well, we want always to know several things when we look at the data. We want to see how large the employment gains have been, but we also want to see whether they are dispersed throughout the various industries and establishments of the country or if they might have just been something that a few or handful of establishments have been able to accomplish. The diffusion index, which consists of 182 nonagricultural industries, gives us an opportunity to identify the dispersion of those job gains.

Representative LUNGREN. I believe you use that something like over 60 percent or two-thirds of those companies surveyed showed an increase?

Ms. NORWOOD. That's right.

Representative LUNGREN. So that's an indication to us that even though it may have been a minimum increase in some of those companies, at least it was a widespread thing not confined to any one or just a couple industries?

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes.

Representative LUNGREN. Ms. Norwood, I again would like to thank you for your testimony.

Senator PROXMIRE. I have one more question.

Before Congressman Lungren finishes, this has been such a nonpartisan, nonpolitical session that I'd like to change it just a little bit. We've got two spectacular graphs over there, one is Republican and one is Democratic. The Republican one for some reason shows unemployment comparison beginning in 1982 and the Democratic one goes back to 1981. If you look at the Democratic one, it's clear that the unemployment rate is higher than what it was when President Reagan took office. If you look at the Republican one, it looks like you've got a real improvement there almost on any standpoint.

Let me just ask you. Is there more or less unemployment in the country than there was 4 years ago? That was the question that in the 1980 debate with President Carter, Ronald Reagan asked that question of President Carter. President Carter had to admit that there was more unemployment and there is more unemployment today than there was 4 years ago; isn't that right?

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes.

Senator PROXMIRE. And, of course, it may be that next month or a couple months from now that Congressman Lungren will be able to come in and point out that there's less.

Representative LUNGREN. And I hope you'll be here.

Senator PROXMIRE. I'll be here, you bet your life, to show how these figures can be rigged sometimes.

Representative LUNGREN. Well, it also appears to me that the unemployment rate appeared to be going up just as the Carter administration was leaving office and certainly well before the Reagan administration had an opportunity to do anything.

Senator PROXMIRE. Well, we're still waiting for them to do something.

Representative LUNGREN. Well, let me just say this, since we're going to end on a bipartisan note, Ms. Norwood, your comments that we have had a 5.1 million increase in jobs in this country is something that should be good news for all Americans. I certainly think it is. And if the administration is going to get blamed in some circumstances, I would just like to say that the administration policies evidently are working to the extent that 5.1 more million Americans are now working. As it has been said, that is the best recovery we've had in terms of increase in jobs during the post-World War II era, which I might add is my entire lifetime.

Senator PROXMIRE. And bought with a deficit which is going to plague our children and grandchildren for generations to come.

Representative LUNGREN. I just wish Senator Proxmire would be able to speak on the floor of the House of Representatives so he might be able to convince some of his comrades on the—his colleagues on the Democratic side that in fact increasing——

Senator PROXMIRE. I like comrades. I like that Republican term. [Laughter.]

Representative LUNGREN. Increasing expenditures for every single appropriation doesn't bring the deficit down.

Senator PROXMIRE. You're right. I agree with that.

Representative LUNGREN. Thank you, Ms. Norwood.

The committee stands adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 10:35 a.m., the committee adjourned, subject to the call of the Chair.]

EMPLOYMENT-UNEMPLOYMENT

FRIDAY, MAY 4, 1984

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE,
Washington, DC.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:35 a.m., in room SD-106, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. Daniel E. Lungren (member of the committee) presiding.

Present: Representative Lungren and Senator Proxmire.

Also present; James K. Galbraith, deputy director; Charles H. Bradford, assistant director; Deborah Clay-Mendez and Mary E. Eccles, professional staff members.

OPENING STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE LUNGREN, PRESIDING

Representative LUNGREN. Madam Commissioner, this morning we learned that the number of Americans holding jobs increased in April by 260,000. This, of course, is the 17th consecutive monthly increase in employment. 104.4 million civilians—more than ever before in our Nation's history—are now at work. That's a sentence I guess that we repeat every month because employment growth has continued unabated and that is certainly good news.

The past 17 months of vigorous economic expansion have created more than 5.3 million civilian jobs. This 17-month gain is unprecedented by post-World War II standards. Employment among civilian men increased by 5 percent during this period. Employment among women increased by 6 percent and employment among blacks increased by 8 percent. We are confident that additional employment gains will be realized by each of these groups as the expansion continues.

During these same 17 months of economic expansion, the overall civilian unemployment rate plummeted 2.9 percentage points. Yet, despite this tremendous improvement in labor market conditions, we have not returned to the double-digit inflation of the past. The Consumer Price Index for urban wage earners and clerical workers increased by only 3.5 percent during the 12-month period which ended in March. In March, the most recent month for which data is available, the index was actually unchanged.

So during the past 4 years under the Reagan administration, economics is not a zero-sum game. Americans are no longer forced to choose between employment and a reasonable degree of price stability.

With lower taxes and less government intrusion into the private sector, there appear to be greater incentives for work and invest-

ment. The effects of these initiatives are gradually being felt in U.S. labor markets and in the economy as a whole.

With these figures which you bring us today and have brought us for the last 17 months, the future looks bright. The consensus of private economists is that the economy will continue to grow through 1984 and 1985. I think we all recognize, Ms. Norwood, that at this stage in the expansion we cannot expect improvements in the unemployment rate on a monthly basis. The April data are consistent with this. Nevertheless, the members of this committee and the American people look forward to the gradual labor market gains that sustained economic growth will bring.

I would like to welcome you once again, Madam Commissioner, to the Joint Economic Committee's monthly hearing on the employment situation and invite you to make your statement after I invite the Senator to make an opening statement.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR PROXMIRE

Senator PROXMIRE. Thank you very much, Congressman. I don't have any big opening statement, but I think that you have put about as rosy a glow on these figures as possibly could be put. I guess that's part of the function of being a Republican chairman.

As I look at this, I think you might say that it's possible that we're bottoming out at a very high level. This is the third consecutive month at which unemployment has been for all workers at 7.7 percent. It was 7.7 percent in February, 7.7 percent in March, 7.7 percent in April and if you look at the breakdown among adult men, adult women, teenagers, whites, blacks, and Hispanics, the most conspicuous element that sticks out to me is that there's been very little change in any of these categories for 3 months.

That doesn't mean that it won't go down in June, but it suggests that it's possible that the consistent improvement that we enjoyed from November 1982 until February may be ending. At least the fact that we have three consecutive months at the same level doesn't seem to me to be very encouraging.

Also, in view of the fact that it's bottoming out at a level of about 8.8 million people out of work. 7.7 percent unemployment is, on the basis of the historic record and particularly on the basis of the last 25 years, a very, very high level, particularly if it means that this is the lowest the unemployment rate will go. We hope and pray that it will go lower. But looking at the figures this morning, it seems to me that we may well be at a point where unemployment may not go lower, too.

Thank you.

Representative LUNGREN. Thank you.

Madam Commissioner, with those hopefully compatible statements from the two of us, we invite your remarks.

STATEMENT OF HON. JANET L. NORWOOD, COMMISSIONER, BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, ACCOMPANIED BY THOMAS J. PLEWES, ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER, OFFICE OF EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT STATISTICS; AND KENNETH V. DALTON, ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER, OFFICE OF PRICES AND LIVING CONDITIONS

Ms. NORWOOD. Thank you very much, Congressman. I will try to stay in the middle. I have with me, as always, Mr. Plewes, who is the Associate Commissioner in charge of Employment and Unemployment Statistics; and Mr. Dalton, our Associate Commissioner for Prices and Living Conditions.

We are always very pleased to be here to try to add a few comments to supplement our release.

Employment continued to rise in April and the factory workweek moved up to the highest level in nearly 20 years. The labor force rose, and unemployment has held steady since February.

Unemployment generally declines in April, and this year the reduction was essentially in line with seasonal expectations. Thus, after seasonal adjustment, both the level and rate of unemployment were unchanged from March to April. The overall rate, which includes the resident Armed Forces in the labor force, was 7.7 percent, and the civilian worker rate was 7.8 percent. Both rates are nearly three percentage points below their recession highs recorded in late 1982.

While the total number of unemployment remained unchanged at 8.8 million, the number of persons on layoff from a former job declined. This component of unemployment—which consists of those persons who are not working but expect recall when economic conditions permit—is a very cyclical category. During the course of the 1981-82 recession, the number of unemployed on layoff rose from 1.3 to 2.5 million. By April, the number had declined to 1.1 million, the lowest level since January 1980. Unemployed job losers—those awaiting recall as well as those permanently separated from their former employers—accounted for 51 percent of the unemployed in April, down from a recession high of 63 percent.

The decline in joblessness for the 17 months of the current recovery compares favorably with prior upturns. Since November 1982, the number of unemployed has dropped by 3 million or 26 percent—a steeper drop than in the first 17 months of any other recovery since the early 1950's.

Employment growth has also been strong in this recovery. Total civilian employment—as measured by the household survey—has advanced by 5.4 percent and payroll employment—as measured by the business survey—by 4.6 percent since November 1982.

The number of nonfarm payroll jobs rose by more than 400,000 in April to 92.9 million, a level 1.4 million higher than before the last recession began. April gains took place in both the goods- and service-producing sectors, and, overall, nearly 70 percent of the industries registered improvement. The largest gain occurred in the services industry, where employment advanced by 175,000. Construction employment rebounded from the weather-depressed March level. Manufacturing gains were particularly strong in machinery, electrical equipment, and printing and publishing. Even

with the April gain, however, the manufacturing industry has regained only two-thirds of the jobs lost in the recession. One reason for this limited recovery of jobs has been the very high level of factory hours. In many cases, employers are expanding working hours rather than hiring additional employees.

The employment expansion in the recovery period and in the last several decades generally has been strongest in the service-producing sector. The proportion of people with a service-producing job has gone from 3 in 10 in 1900, to 5 in 10 in 1950, and to 7 in 10 today. This dramatic shift to the service sector has, however, not been made at the expense of the goods-producing sector. Many of the new workers in services are people who have recently come into the labor force. It is important to recognize that, except during cyclical downturns, employment in the goods-producing sector has not declined. In periods of economic recovery, goods employment has grown, though clearly at a much slower pace than in the service-producing sector.

Within the service-producing sector, particularly strong growth has occured in business and health services. Employment in health services grew by nearly 300,000 during the recession and another 200,000 thus far in the recovery period. Growth in business service employment was limited to 45,000 during the recession but has expanded by 700,000 in the last 17 months. An important source of business service growth has been among firms that provide services for other firms that otherwise would be performing these jobs themselves.

The civilian labor force increased in April. The gain was concentrated among adult women, whose participation rate has risen in recent months after holding steady earlier in the recovery period. Over the past year, the labor force has grown by 2.3 million. Looking separately at some key demographic groups, we can see that the entire gain took place among those 25 to 54 years of age. Within this prime working age group, increases were registered both for men—1 million—and women—1.3 million.

When comparing this past year with earlier periods of more rapid labor force growth, it is striking that the difference is essentially limited to developments among youth, which, in turn, stem from underlying population trends. In the year ending in December 1978, for example, there was an increase of nearly 900,000 in the 16- to 24-year-old labor force. During that same year the overall labor force growth was 3.4 million, one of the largest yearly increases ever recorded. Had the number of 16 to 24 year olds in the labor force held steady then as it did over the past year, the overall growth would have been 2.5 million, not much different from our current experience.

In summary, strong employment growth continued in April, the workweek increased, and the unemployment rate held steady for the third month in a row.

We would be happy to try to answer any questions the committee may have.

[The table attached to Ms. Norwood's statement, together with the Employment Situation press release referred to, follows:]

UNEMPLOYMENT RATES OF ALL CIVILIAN WORKERS BY ALTERNATIVE SEASONAL ADJUSTMENT METHODS

Month and year	Unadjusted rate	X-11 ARIMA method					X-11 method (official method before 1980)	Range (cols. 2-7)
		Official procedure	Concurrent	Stable	Total	Residual		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
1983								
April	10.0	10.2	10.2	10.2	10.3	10.2	10.3	0.1
May	9.8	10.1	10.1	10.2	10.1	10.1	10.1	.1
June	10.2	10.0	10.0	10.0	9.8	10.0	10.0	.2
July	9.4	9.5	9.5	9.4	9.5	9.5	9.5	.1
August	9.2	9.5	9.5	9.4	9.5	9.5	9.5	.1
September	8.8	9.2	9.2	9.2	9.2	9.1	9.3	.2
October	8.4	8.8	8.8	9.0	8.8	8.8	8.9	.2
November	8.1	8.4	8.4	8.5	8.4	8.4	8.4	.1
December	8.0	8.2	8.2	8.4	8.2	8.2	8.2	.2
1984								
January	8.8	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.1	8.0	8.0	.1
February	8.4	7.8	7.8	7.6	7.8	7.7	7.8	.2
March	8.1	7.8	7.8	7.7	7.8	7.6	7.7	.2
April	7.6	7.8	7.8	7.8	7.8	7.8	7.8	.....

Explanation of Column Heads

(1) Unadjusted rate. Unemployment rate for all civilian workers, not seasonally adjusted.

(2) Official procedure (X-11 ARIMA method). The published seasonally adjusted rate for all civilian workers. Each of the 3 major civilian labor force components—agricultural employment, nonagricultural employment and unemployment—for 4 age-sex groups—males and females, ages 16-19 and 20 years and over—are seasonally adjusted independently using data from January 1974 forward. The data series for each of these 12 components are extended by a year at each end of the original series using ARIMA (Auto-Regressive, Integrated, Moving Average) models chosen specifically for each series. Each extended series is then seasonally adjusted with the X-11 portion of the X-11 ARIMA program. The 4 teenage unemployment and nonagricultural employment components are adjusted with the additive adjustment model, while the other components are adjusted with the multiplicative model. The unemployment rate is computed by summing the 4 seasonally adjusted unemployment components and calculating that total as a percent of the civilian labor force total derived by summing all 12 seasonally adjusted components. All the seasonally adjusted series are revised at the end of each year. Extrapolated factors for January-June are computed at the beginning of each year; extrapolated factors for July-December are computed in the middle of the year after the June data become available. Each set of 6-month factors are published in advance, in the January and July issues, respectively, of Employment and Earnings.

(3) Concurrent (X-11 ARIMA method). The official procedure for computation of the rate for all civilian workers using the 12 components is followed except that extrapolated factors are not used at all. Each component is seasonally adjusted with the X-11 ARIMA program each month as the most recent data become available. Rates for each month of the current year are shown as first computed; they are revised only once each year, at the end of the year when data for the full year become available. For example, the rate of January 1984 would be based, during 1984, on the adjustment of data from the period January 1974 through January 1984.

(4) Stable (X-11 ARIMA method). Each of the 12 civilian labor force components is extended using ARIMA models as in the official procedure and then run through the X-11 part of the program using the stable option. This option assumes that seasonal patterns are basically constant from year-to-year and computes final seasonal factors as unweighted averages of all the seasonal-irregular components for each month across the entire span of the period adjusted. As in the official procedure,

factors are extrapolated in 6-month intervals and the series are revised at the end of each year. The procedure for computation of the rate from the seasonally adjusted components is also identical to the official procedure.

(5) Total (X-11 ARIMA method). This is one alternative aggregation procedure, in which total unemployment and civilian labor force levels are extended with ARIMA models and directly adjusted with multiplicative adjustment models in the X-11 part of the program. The rate is computed by taking seasonally adjusted total unemployment as a percent of seasonally adjusted total civilian labor force. Factors are extrapolated in 6-month intervals and the series revised at the end of each year.

(6) Residual (X-11 ARIMA method). This is another alternative aggregation method, in which total civilian employment and civilian labor force levels are extended using ARIMA models and then directly adjusted with multiplicative adjustment models. The seasonally adjusted unemployment level is derived by subtracting seasonally adjusted employment from seasonally adjusted labor force. The rate is then computed by taking the derived unemployment level as a percent of the labor force level. Factors are extrapolated in 6-month intervals and the series revised at the end of each year.

(7) X-11 method (official method before 1980). The method for computation of the official procedure is used except that the series are not extended with ARIMA models and the factors are projected in 12-month intervals. The standard X-11 program is used to perform the seasonal adjustment.

Methods of Adjustment: The X-11 ARIMA method was developed at Statistics Canada by the Seasonal Adjustment and Times Series Staff under the direction of Estela Bee Dagum. The method is described in "The X-11 ARIMA Seasonal Adjustment Method," by Estela Bee Dagum, Statistics Canada Catalogue No. 12-564E, February 1980.

The standard X-11 method is described in "X-11 Variant of the Census Method II Seasonal Adjustment Program," by Julius Shiskin, Allan Young, and John Musgrave (Technical Paper No. 15, Bureau of the Census, 1967).

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, May 1984.

News

U.S. Department of Labor
Bureau of Labor Statistics
Washington, D.C. 20212

Technical information: (202) 523-1944
523-1371
523-1959
Media contact: 523-1913

USDL 84-204
TRANSMISSION OF MATERIAL IN THIS RELEASE IS EMBARGOED UNTIL 8:30 A.M. (EDT), FRIDAY, MAY 4, 1984

THE EMPLOYMENT SITUATION: APRIL 1984

Employment continued to increase in April and unemployment was unchanged, the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U.S. Department of Labor reported today. The overall unemployment rate, 7.7 percent, and the rate for civilian workers, 7.8 percent, each remained at the levels which prevailed in February and March.

Civilian employment--as measured by the monthly survey of households--rose by 260,000 in April to 104.4 million, seasonally adjusted. The number of employees on nonagricultural payrolls--as measured by the monthly survey of establishments--increased by 410,000 to 92.9 million, seasonally adjusted. The April job gain was led by strong advances in services, manufacturing, and construction. The factory workweek rose six-tenths of an hour to 41.2 hours in April, the highest level in nearly 2 decades.

Unemployment (Household Survey Data)

The number of unemployed persons and the unemployment rate were both unchanged in April after seasonal adjustment. A total of 8.8 million persons were unemployed; the civilian worker jobless rate was 7.8 percent, about the same as in the 2 previous months but nearly 3 percentage points below the late 1982 recession high.

Among the major worker groups, the unemployment rate for adult men, at 6.9 percent, was about unchanged in April. The rate for adult women, also about unchanged from March, has been almost the same as that for adult men over the February-April period. This is in contrast to the pattern which prevailed from mid-1982 through January 1984, when the rate for adult men, who were affected much more severely by the recession, exceeded that for adult women. The teenage unemployment rate (19.4 percent in April) has shown little change since last November, after declining moderately from a recession high of over 24 percent. Jobless rates for whites (6.7 percent), blacks (16.8 percent), and Hispanics (11.5 percent) all held steady between March and April. (See tables A-2 and A-3.)

In terms of the duration of unemployment, there was little change in the individual duration categories. Half of the unemployed were jobless for 8 weeks or less. (See table A-7.)

Job losers--persons on layoff who expect to return to their job, as well as those who have permanently lost their job--accounted for 51 percent of total unemployment in April, compared with 62 percent in November 1982. Unemployment among persons on layoff declined to 1.1 million in April, substantially below the recession high of 2.5 million in September 1982. (See table A-8.)

Civilian Employment and the Labor Force (Household Survey Data)

Civilian employment continued to increase from March to April, with most of the gain taking place among adult women. At 104.4 million, seasonally adjusted, civilian employment has advanced by 5.4 million from the 1982 recession low. During the 17-month recovery period, strong employment gains were posted by adult men (2.9 million) and women (2.4 million). Teenage employment held about steady, as declines in their population were offset by increases in the proportion of teenagers with jobs.

The civilian labor force rose by about 330,000 to 113.2 million in April. Over the year, labor force growth totaled nearly 2.3 million--about 1.4 million adult women and 950,000 adult men. (See table A-2.)

Industry Payroll Employment (Establishment Survey Data)

Nonagricultural payroll employment rose by 410,000 in April, following a smaller increase in March. Gains were quite widespread as more than two-thirds of the 186 industries in the BLS diffusion index posted over-the-month increases. At 92.9 million, payroll employment was up more than 4.1 million since November 1982. (See tables B-1 and B-6.)

Almost half of the April job gains were in the goods-producing sector. Mining employment was up by nearly 10,000 and construction by about 75,000; most of the construction gains occurred among special trade contractors (contractors specializing in masonry, concrete, electrical work, etc.). Factory employment continued to rise, posting a gain of 100,000. Durable goods increases occurred largely in machinery and electrical and electronic equipment, while in nondurable goods, food processing and printing and publishing posted the strongest job growth.

Table A. Major indicators of labor market activity, seasonally adjusted

Category	Quarterly averages			Monthly data			Mar.-Apr. change
	1983		1984	1984			
	I	IV	I	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	
HOUSEHOLD DATA							
	Thousands of persons						
Labor force 1/	112,365	113,702	114,292	114,377	114,598	114,938	340
Total employment 1/	100,879	104,195	105,426	105,576	105,826	106,095	269
Civilian labor force	110,700	112,012	112,607	112,693	112,912	113,245	333
Civilian employment	99,214	102,506	103,740	103,892	104,140	104,402	262
Unemployment	11,486	9,507	8,866	8,801	8,772	8,843	71
Not in labor force	62,805	62,938	63,072	62,986	62,912	62,724	-188
Discouraged workers	1,765	1,457	1,339	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
	Percent of labor force						
Unemployment rates:							
All workers 1/	10.2	8.4	7.8	7.7	7.7	7.7	0
All civilian workers	10.4	8.5	7.9	7.8	7.8	7.8	0
Adult men	9.7	7.8	7.0	7.0	6.8	6.9	0.1
Adult women	8.9	7.2	7.0	6.9	6.9	7.0	0.1
Teenagers	23.1	20.6	19.6	19.3	19.9	19.4	-0.5
White	9.1	7.4	6.8	6.7	6.7	6.7	0
Black	20.2	17.9	16.5	16.2	16.6	16.8	0.2
Hispanic origin	15.6	12.1	10.9	10.2	11.3	11.5	0.2
ESTABLISHMENT DATA							
	Thousands of jobs						
Nonfarm payroll employment	88,815	91,346	92,264p	92,357	92,506p	92,913p	407p
Goods-producing industries	23,088	24,298	24,728p	24,784	24,783p	24,966p	183p
Service-producing industries	65,727	67,048	67,536p	67,573	67,723p	67,947p	224p
	Hours of work						
Average weekly hours:							
Total private nonfarm	34.8	35.3	35.4p	35.4	35.2p	35.6p	0.4p
Manufacturing	39.5	40.6	40.9p	41.0	40.6p	41.2p	0.6p
Manufacturing overtime	2.5	3.3	3.5p	3.6	3.4p	3.7p	0.3p

1/ Includes the resident Armed Forces.
p=preliminary.
N.A.=not available.

Within the service-producing sector, a particularly sizable employment increase took place in the services industry--175,000--with business services accounting for a large part of this gain. Employment advances also took place in wholesale trade and finance, insurance, and real estate.

Weekly Hours (Establishment Survey Data)

Average weekly hours for production or nonsupervisory workers on nonagricultural payrolls rose by 0.4 hour to 35.6 hours in April, after falling slightly in the prior 2 months. The April level was the highest since early 1980. While all major industry groups posted increases on a seasonally adjusted basis, the workweek in manufacturing registered the largest gain. Total manufacturing hours and factory overtime were up 0.6 hour and 0.3 hour to the unusually high levels of 41.2 and 3.7 hours, respectively. (See table B-2.)

The index of aggregate weekly hours of production or nonsupervisory workers on private nonagricultural payrolls rose 1.5 percent to 111.5 (1977=100) in April. The largest increase was in construction (4.9 percent), which had fallen sharply in the previous month, due largely to bad weather during the March survey week. A gain in the manufacturing index of 2.3 percent reflected strong increases in both hours and employment; manufacturing was up 15.5 percent from November 1982. (See table B-5.)

Hourly and Weekly Earnings (Establishment Survey Data)

Average hourly earnings rose 0.6 percent in April, seasonally adjusted. Coupled with the strong gain in the average workweek, there was a rise of almost 1.7 percent in average weekly earnings. Before adjustment for seasonality, average hourly earnings rose 5 cents in April to $8.29, and weekly earnings rose by $4.25 to $293.47. Over the year, hourly earnings were up 35 cents, and weekly earnings rose by $17.95. (See table B-3.)

The Hourly Earnings Index (Establishment Survey Data)

The Hourly Earnings Index (HEI) was 159.6 (1977=100) in April, seasonally adjusted, an increase of 0.5 percent from March. For the 12 months ended in April, the increase (before seasonal adjustment) was 3.6 percent. The HEI excludes the effects of two types of changes unrelated to underlying wage rate movements--fluctuations in overtime in manufacturing and interindustry employment shifts. In dollars of constant purchasing power, the HEI decreased 0.1 percent during the 12-month period ended in March. (See table B-4.)

****
*
* The establishment-based series on employment, hours, and earnings will *
* be revised next month to reflect the annual employment benchmark *
* adjustments and updated seasonal factors. The Employment Situation release *
* of May data, scheduled for June 1, will include the revisions. *
*
****

36-618 O 84 - 10

Explanatory Note

This news release presents statistics from two major surveys, the Current Population Survey (household survey) and the Current Employment Statistics Survey (establishment survey). The household survey provides the information on the labor force, total employment, and unemployment that appears in the A tables, marked HOUSEHOLD DATA. It is a sample survey of about 60,000 households that is conducted by the Bureau of the Census with most of the findings analyzed and published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS).

The establishment survey provides the information on the employment, hours, and earnings of workers on nonagricultural payrolls that appears in the B tables, marked ESTABLISHMENT DATA. This information is collected from payroll records by BLS in cooperation with State agencies. The sample includes approximately 189,000 establishments employing about 36 million people.

For both surveys, the data for a given month are actually collected for and relate to a particular week. In the household survey, unless otherwise indicated, it is the calendar week that contains the 12th day of the month, which is called the survey week. In the establishment survey, the reference week is the pay period including the 12th, which may or may not correspond directly to the calendar week.

The data in this release are affected by a number of technical factors, including definitions, survey differences, seasonal adjustments, and the inevitable variance in results between a survey of a sample and a census of the entire population. Each of these factors is explained below.

Coverage, definitions and differences between surveys

The sample households in the household survey are selected so as to reflect the entire civilian noninstitutional population 16 years of age and older. Each person in a household is classified as employed, unemployed, or not in the labor force. Those who hold more than one job are classified according to the job at which they worked the most hours.

People are classified as *employed* if they did any work at all as paid civilians; worked in their own business or profession or on their own farm; or worked 15 hours or more in an enterprise operated by a member of their family, whether they were paid or not. People are also counted as employed if they were on unpaid leave because of illness, bad weather, disputes between labor and management, or personal reasons. Members of the Armed Forces stationed in the United States are also included in the employed total.

People are classified as *unemployed*, regardless of their eligibility for unemployment benefits or public assistance, if they meet all of the following criteria: They had no employment during the survey week; they were available for work at that time; and they made specific efforts to find employment sometime during the prior 4 weeks. Also included among the unemployed are persons not looking for work because they were laid off and waiting to be recalled and those expecting to report to a job within 30 days.

The *labor force* equals the sum of the number employed and the number unemployed. The *unemployment rate* is the percentage of unemployed people in the labor force (civilian plus the resident Armed Forces). Table A-5 presents a special grouping of seven measures of unemployment based on varying definitions of unemployment and the labor force. The definitions are provided in the table. The most restrictive definition yields U-1, and the most comprehensive yields U-7. The overall unemployment rate is U-5a, while U-5b represents the same measure with a civilian labor force base.

Unlike the household survey, the establishment survey only counts wage and salary employees whose names appear on the payroll records of nonagricultural firms. As a result, there are many differences between the two surveys, among which are the following:

-----The household survey, although based on a smaller sample, reflects a larger segment of the population; the establishment survey excludes agriculture, the self-employed, unpaid family workers, private household workers, and members of the resident Armed Forces;

-----The household survey includes people on unpaid leave among the employed; the establishment survey does not;

-----The household survey is limited to those 16 years of age and older; the establishment survey is not limited by age;

-----The household survey has no duplication of individuals, because each individual is counted only once; in the establishment survey, employees working at more than one job or otherwise appearing on more than one payroll would be counted separately for each appearance.

Other differences between the two surveys are described in "Comparing Employment Estimates from Household and Payroll Surveys," which may be obtained from the BLS upon request.

Seasonal adjustment

Over a course of a year, the size of the Nation's labor force and the levels of employment and unemployment undergo sharp fluctuations due to such seasonal events as changes in weather, reduced or expanded production, harvests, major holidays, and the opening and closing of schools. For example, the labor force increases by a large number each June, when schools close and many young people enter the job market. The effect of such seasonal variation can be very large; over the course of a year, for example, seasonality may account for as much as 95 percent of the month-to-month changes in unemployment.

Because these seasonal events follow a more or less regular pattern each year, their influence on statistical trends can be eliminated by adjusting the statistics from month to month. These adjustments make nonseasonal developments, such as declines in economic activity or increases in the participation of women in the labor force, easier to spot. To return to the school's-out example, the large number of people entering the labor force each June is likely to obscure any other changes that have taken place since May, making it difficult to determine if the level of economic activity has risen or declined. However, because the effect of students finishing school in previous years is known, the statistics for the current year can be adjusted to allow for a comparable change. Insofar as the seasonal adjustment is made correctly, the adjusted figure provides a more useful tool with which to analyze changes in economic activity.

Measures of labor force, employment, and unemployment contain components such as age and sex. Statistics for all

employees, production workers, average weekly hours, and average hourly earnings include components based on the employer's industry. All these statistics can be seasonally adjusted either by adjusting the total or by adjusting each of the components and combining them. The second procedure usually yields more accurate information and is therefore followed by BLS. For example, the seasonally adjusted figure for the labor force is the sum of eight seasonally adjusted civilian employment components, plus the resident Armed Forces total (not adjusted for seasonality), and four seasonally adjusted unemployment components; the total for unemployment is the sum of the four unemployment components; and the overall unemployment rate is derived by dividing the resulting estimate of total unemployment by the estimate of the labor force.

The numerical factors used to make the seasonal adjustments are recalculated regularly. For the household survey, the factors are calculated for the January-June period and again for the July-December period. The January revision is applied to data that have been published over the previous 5 years. For the establishment survey, updated factors for seasonal adjustment are calculated only once a year, along with the introduction of new benchmarks which are discussed at the end of the next section.

Sampling variability

Statistics based on the household and establishment surveys are subject to sampling error, that is, the estimate of the number of people employed and the other estimates drawn from these surveys probably differ from the figures that would be obtained from a complete census, even if the same questionnaires and procedures were used. In the household survey, the amount of the differences can be expressed in terms of standard errors. The numerical value of a standard error depends upon the size of the sample, the results of the survey, and other factors. However, the numerical value is always such that the chances are 68 out of 100 that an estimate based on the sample will differ by no more than the standard error from the results of a complete census. The chances are 90 out of 100 that an estimate based on the sample will differ by no more than 1.6 times the standard error from the results of a complete census. At the 90-percent level of confidence--the confidence limits used by BLS in its analyses--the error for the monthly change in total employment is on the order of plus or minus 328,000; for total unemployment it is 220,000; and, for the overall unemployment rate, it is 0.19 percentage point. These figures do not mean that the sample results are off by these magnitudes but, rather, that the chances are 90 out of 100 that the "true" level or rate would not be expected to differ from the estimates by more than these amounts.

Sampling errors for monthly surveys are reduced when the data are cumulated for several months, such as quarterly or annually. Also, as a general rule, the smaller the estimate, the larger the sampling error. Therefore, relatively speaking, the estimate of the size of the labor force is subject to less error than is the estimate of the number unemployed. And, among the unemployed, the sampling error for the jobless rate of adult men, for example, is much smaller than is the error for the jobless rate of teenagers. Specifically, the error on monthly change in the jobless rate for men is .26 percentage point; for teenagers, it is 1.25 percentage points.

In the establishment survey, estimates for the 2 most current months are based on incomplete returns; for this reason, these estimates are labeled preliminary in the tables. When all the returns in the sample have been received, the estimates are revised. In other words, data for the month of September are published in preliminary form in October and November and in final form in December. To remove errors that build up over time, a comprehensive count of the employed is conducted each year. The results of this survey are used to establish new benchmarks—comprehensive counts of employment—against which month-to-month changes can be measured. The new benchmarks also incorporate changes in the classification of industries and allow for the formation of new establishments.

Additional statistics and other information

In order to provide a broad view of the Nation's employment situation, BLS regularly publishes a wide variety of data in this news release. More comprehensive statistics are contained in *Employment and Earnings*, published each month by BLS. It is available for $6.00 per issue or $39.00 per year from the U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20204. A check or money order made out to the Superintendent of Documents must accompany all orders.

Employment and Earnings also provides approximations of the standard errors for the household survey data published in this release. For unemployment and other labor force categories, the standard errors appear in tables B through J of its "Explanatory Notes." Measures of the reliability of the data drawn from the establishment survey and the actual amounts of revision due to benchmark adjustments are provided in tables M, O, P, and Q of that publication.

Table A-1. Employment status of the population, including Armed Forces in the United States, by sex

(Numbers in thousands)

Employment status and sex	Not seasonally adjusted			Seasonally adjusted[1]					
	Apr. 1983	Mar. 1984	Apr. 1984	Apr. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984	Feb. 1984	Mar. 1984	Apr. 1984
TOTAL									
Noninstitutional population[2]	175,465	177,510	177,662	175,465	176,809	177,219	177,363	177,510	177,662
Labor force[3]	111,546	113,514	113,865	112,646	113,824	113,901	114,377	114,598	114,938
Participation rate[4]	63.6	63.9	64.1	64.2	64.4	64.3	64.5	64.6	64.7
Total employed[5]	100,511	104,456	105,321	101,277	104,629	104,876	105,574	105,826	106,095
Employment-population ratio[6]	57.3	58.8	59.3	57.7	59.2	59.2	59.5	59.6	59.7
Resident Armed Forces	1,671	1,686	1,693	1,671	1,680	1,686	1,684	1,686	1,693
Civilian employed	98,840	102,770	103,628	99,606	102,941	103,190	103,892	104,140	104,402
Agriculture	3,185	2,872	3,191	3,392	3,356	3,271	3,395	3,281	3,393
Nonagricultural industries	95,655	99,898	100,437	96,214	99,585	99,918	100,496	100,859	101,009
Unemployed	10,035	9,057	8,525	11,369	9,195	9,026	8,803	8,772	8,843
Unemployment rate[7]	9.0	8.0	7.5	10.1	8.1	7.9	7.7	7.7	7.7
Not in labor force	63,919	63,996	63,817	62,819	62,985	63,318	62,986	62,912	62,724
Men, 16 years and over									
Noninstitutional population[2]	83,856	84,880	84,953	83,856	84,506	84,745	84,811	84,880	84,953
Labor force[3]	63,780	64,468	64,575	64,311	64,838	64,930	65,093	65,156	65,212
Participation rate[4]	76.0	76.0	76.0	76.7	76.7	76.6	76.8	76.8	76.8
Total employed[5]	56,964	59,164	59,665	57,589	59,580	59,781	60,147	60,290	60,293
Employment-population ratio[6]	67.9	69.7	70.2	68.7	70.5	70.5	70.9	71.0	71.0
Resident Armed Forces	1,530	1,542	1,548	1,530	1,537	1,542	1,548	1,542	1,548
Civilian employed	55,434	57,622	58,117	56,059	58,043	58,239	58,607	58,748	58,745
Unemployed	6,736	5,304	4,909	6,722	5,258	5,149	4,946	4,867	4,919
Unemployment rate[7]	10.6	8.2	7.6	10.5	8.1	7.9	7.6	7.5	7.5
Women, 16 years and over									
Noninstitutional population[2]	91,609	92,630	92,709	91,609	92,332	92,474	92,552	92,630	92,709
Labor force[3]	47,846	49,045	49,271	48,335	48,986	48,971	49,283	49,442	49,725
Participation rate[4]	52.2	52.9	53.1	52.8	53.1	53.0	53.2	53.4	53.6
Total employed[5]	43,547	45,292	45,655	43,688	45,049	45,094	45,429	45,536	45,802
Employment-population ratio[6]	47.5	48.9	49.2	47.7	48.8	48.8	49.1	49.2	49.4
Resident Armed Forces	141	144	145	141	151	144	144	144	145
Civilian employed	43,406	45,148	45,510	43,547	44,898	44,950	45,285	45,392	45,657
Unemployed	4,299	3,753	3,615	4,647	3,937	3,876	3,855	3,905	3,924
Unemployment rate[7]	9.0	7.7	7.3	9.6	8.0	7.9	7.8	7.9	7.9

[1] The population and Armed Forces figures are not adjusted for seasonal variation; therefore, identical numbers appear in the unadjusted and seasonally adjusted columns.

[2] Includes members of the Armed Forces stationed in the United States.

[3] Labor force as a percent of the noninstitutional population.

[4] Total employment as a percent of the noninstitutional population.

[5] Unemployment as a percent of the labor force (including the resident Armed Forces).

Table A-2. Employment status of the civilian population by sex and age

(Numbers in thousands)

Employment status, sex, and age	Not seasonally adjusted			Seasonally adjusted[1]					
	Apr. 1983	Mar. 1984	Apr. 1984	Apr. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984	Feb. 1984	Mar. 1984	Apr. 1984
TOTAL									
Civilian noninstitutional population	173,794	175,824	175,969	173,794	175,121	175,533	175,679	175,824	175,969
Civilian labor force	109,875	111,828	112,152	110,975	112,136	112,215	112,693	112,912	113,265
Participation rate	63.2	63.6	63.7	63.9	64.0	63.9	64.1	64.2	64.4
Employed	98,840	102,770	103,628	99,606	102,981	103,190	103,892	104,140	104,402
Employment-population ratio[2]	56.9	58.5	58.9	57.3	58.8	58.8	59.1	59.2	59.3
Unemployed	11,035	9,057	8,525	11,369	9,155	9,026	8,801	8,772	8,863
Unemployment rate	10.0	8.1	7.6	10.2	8.2	8.0	7.8	7.8	7.8
Men, 20 years and over									
Civilian noninstitutional population	74,611	75,080	75,973	74,611	75,433	75,692	75,786	75,880	75,973
Civilian labor force	58,262	59,104	59,203	58,512	59,050	59,299	59,394	59,388	59,480
Participation rate	78.1	77.9	77.9	78.4	78.3	78.3	78.4	78.3	78.3
Employed	52,469	54,630	55,022	52,830	54,658	54,999	55,266	55,368	55,385
Employment-population ratio[2]	70.3	72.0	72.4	70.8	72.5	72.7	72.9	73.0	72.9
Agriculture	2,322	2,156	2,355	2,424	2,374	2,356	2,409	2,364	2,453
Nonagricultural industries	50,147	52,474	52,667	50,409	52,284	52,643	52,857	53,004	52,932
Unemployed	5,793	4,474	4,181	5,682	4,392	4,300	4,128	4,020	4,095
Unemployment rate	9.9	7.6	7.1	9.7	7.4	7.3	7.0	6.8	6.9
Women, 20 years and over									
Civilian noninstitutional population	83,794	85,064	85,168	83,794	84,666	84,860	84,962	85,064	85,168
Civilian labor force	44,142	45,454	45,562	44,381	45,024	44,988	45,258	45,459	45,703
Participation rate	52.7	53.4	53.5	52.9	53.2	53.0	53.3	53.4	53.7
Employed	40,618	42,363	42,594	40,531	41,843	41,798	42,138	42,315	42,517
Employment-population ratio[2]	48.5	49.8	50.0	48.4	49.4	49.3	49.6	49.7	49.9
Agriculture	572	496	570	621	653	625	640	574	619
Nonagricultural industries	40,046	41,866	42,024	39,910	41,190	41,174	41,498	41,741	41,898
Unemployed	3,524	3,091	2,969	3,780	3,181	3,182	3,120	3,144	3,186
Unemployment rate	8.0	6.8	6.5	8.5	7.1	7.1	6.9	6.9	7.0
Both sexes, 16 to 19 years									
Civilian noninstitutional population	15,389	14,680	14,828	15,389	15,022	14,981	14,930	14,680	14,828
Civilian labor force	7,471	7,270	7,387	8,152	8,062	7,935	8,041	8,065	8,062
Participation rate	48.5	48.9	49.8	53.0	53.7	53.0	53.5	54.2	54.4
Employed	5,753	5,778	6,012	6,245	6,480	6,392	6,480	6,457	6,500
Employment-population ratio[2]	37.4	38.8	40.5	40.6	42.9	42.7	43.5	43.4	43.8
Agriculture	291	220	266	350	329	290	346	383	321
Nonagricultural industries	5,462	5,558	5,745	5,895	6,151	6,102	6,102	6,114	6,179
Unemployed	1,718	1,492	1,375	1,907	1,622	1,543	1,553	1,608	1,562
Unemployment rate	23.0	20.5	18.6	23.4	20.1	19.4	19.3	19.9	19.4

[1] The population figures are not adjusted for seasonal variation; therefore, identical numbers appear in the unadjusted and seasonally adjusted columns.

[2] Civilian employment as a percent of the civilian noninstitutional population.

HOUSEHOLD DATA

Table A-3. Employment status of the civilian population by race, sex, age, and Hispanic origin

(Numbers in thousands)

Employment status, race, sex, age, and Hispanic origin	Not seasonally adjusted			Seasonally adjusted[1]					
	Apr. 1983	Mar. 1984	Apr. 1984	Apr. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984	Feb. 1984	Mar. 1984	Apr. 1984
WHITE									
Civilian noninstitutional population	150,518	152,285	152,478	150,588	151,484	151,939	152,079	152,285	152,478
Civilian labor force	95,631	97,516	97,625	96,450	97,724	97,813	98,167	98,424	98,495
Participation rate	63.5	64.0	64.2	64.1	64.5	64.4	64.6	64.6	64.7
Employed	87,216	90,649	91,240	87,858	90,779	91,044	91,544	91,845	91,933
Employment-population ratio[2]	57.9	59.5	60.0	58.4	59.9	59.9	60.2	60.3	60.4
Unemployed	8,415	6,895	6,381	8,596	6,945	6,768	6,623	6,580	6,562
Unemployment rate	8.8	7.1	6.5	8.9	7.1	6.9	6.7	6.7	6.7
Men, 20 years and over									
Civilian labor force	54,290	52,126	52,453	54,480	52,063	52,270	52,335	52,398	52,406
Participation rate	78.4	78.4	78.6	78.7	78.9	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8
Employed	46,767	48,652	48,984	47,085	48,589	48,964	49,149	49,303	49,329
Employment-population ratio[2]	74.5	73.4	73.7	72.0	73.6	73.8	74.0	74.2	74.2
Unemployed	4,524	3,474	3,469	4,395	3,474	3,306	3,186	3,055	3,077
Unemployment rate	8.8	6.7	6.1	8.5	6.7	6.3	6.1	5.8	5.9
Women, 20 years and over									
Civilian labor force	37,690	38,884	38,934	37,793	38,556	38,505	38,726	38,873	39,032
Participation rate	52.8	52.9	53.0	52.2	52.8	52.6	52.8	52.9	53.1
Employed	35,147	36,643	36,761	35,049	36,292	36,180	36,465	36,570	36,668
Employment-population ratio[2]	48.6	49.9	50.0	48.4	49.7	49.4	49.7	49.8	49.9
Unemployed	2,543	2,241	2,173	2,744	2,264	2,325	2,261	2,303	2,364
Unemployment rate	6.7	5.8	5.6	7.3	5.9	6.0	5.8	5.9	6.0
Both sexes, 16 to 19 years									
Civilian labor force	6,651	6,503	6,538	7,477	7,105	7,038	7,106	7,153	7,057
Participation rate	52.2	53.0	53.5	56.3	57.2	56.9	57.7	58.3	57.7
Employed	5,303	5,324	5,499	5,720	5,898	5,900	5,930	5,932	5,916
Employment-population ratio[2]	41.6	43.4	45.0	46.9	47.5	47.7	48.1	48.3	48.4
Unemployed	1,349	1,179	1,039	1,757	1,207	1,138	1,176	1,220	1,141
Unemployment rate	20.3	18.1	15.9	20.3	17.0	16.2	16.5	17.1	16.2
Men	21.4	19.3	16.4	21.4	17.5	17.0	16.4	17.3	16.6
Women	19.0	16.9	15.4	19.1	16.5	14.5	16.7	16.8	15.7
BLACK									
Civilian noninstitutional population	18,854	19,248	19,274	18,851	19,086	19,196	19,222	19,248	19,274
Civilian labor force	11,412	11,692	11,694	11,651	11,650	11,660	11,881	11,867	11,934
Participation rate	60.5	60.7	60.7	61.8	61.0	60.7	61.8	61.7	61.9
Employed	9,108	9,748	9,778	9,245	9,582	9,707	9,958	9,896	9,923
Employment-population ratio[2]	48.3	50.6	50.7	49.0	50.2	50.6	51.8	51.4	51.5
Unemployed	2,304	1,951	1,916	2,406	2,068	1,953	1,923	1,972	2,011
Unemployment rate	20.2	16.7	16.4	20.7	17.8	16.7	16.2	16.6	16.8
Men, 20 years and over									
Civilian labor force	5,505	5,649	5,582	5,530	5,565	5,624	5,677	5,660	5,607
Participation rate	75.2	74.5	73.9	75.6	73.7	74.0	75.4	75.0	74.2
Employed	4,397	4,722	4,684	4,425	4,722	4,789	4,877	4,789	4,712
Employment-population ratio[2]	60.4	62.6	62.0	60.5	63.4	63.7	64.8	63.5	62.4
Unemployed	1,107	897	898	1,105	843	833	800	871	894
Unemployment rate	20.1	16.0	16.1	20.0	15.1	14.8	14.1	15.4	16.0
Women, 20 years and over									
Civilian labor force	5,217	5,413	5,396	5,288	5,303	5,277	5,408	5,425	5,469
Participation rate	56.1	56.8	56.5	56.9	56.2	55.6	56.9	57.0	57.3
Employed	4,350	4,657	4,685	4,396	4,461	4,522	4,630	4,690	4,737
Employment-population ratio[2]	46.8	48.9	49.1	47.3	47.3	47.7	48.7	49.2	49.6
Unemployed	867	756	711	892	842	755	777	735	731
Unemployment rate	16.6	14.0	13.2	16.9	15.9	14.3	14.4	13.5	13.4
Both sexes, 16 to 19 years									
Civilian labor force	698	660	746	833	782	762	796	783	859
Participation rate	30.9	30.3	32.9	37.2	35.6	34.7	36.4	35.9	39.5
Employed	360	363	409	424	399	397	450	417	474
Employment-population ratio[2]	16.9	16.6	18.0	18.9	18.2	18.1	20.6	19.1	21.8
Unemployed	338	298	307	409	383	365	346	366	385
Unemployment rate	47.8	45.1	42.9	49.1	49.0	47.9	43.5	46.7	44.8
Men	48.1	44.4	41.8	48.6	46.4	47.1	46.7	46.4	42.8
Women	47.6	46.0	44.6	49.6	51.9	48.8	39.9	49.6	47.1
HISPANIC ORIGIN									
Civilian noninstitutional population	9,665	10,080	10,072	9,665	9,735	9,778	9,906	10,080	10,072
Civilian labor force	6,128	6,392	6,352	6,161	6,267	6,336	6,292	6,484	6,378
Participation rate	63.4	63.4	63.1	63.7	64.4	64.8	63.5	64.3	63.3
Employed	5,262	5,636	5,649	5,259	5,540	5,627	5,652	5,755	5,643
Employment-population ratio[2]	54.4	55.9	56.1	54.4	56.9	57.6	57.1	57.1	56.0
Unemployed	865	756	703	902	727	708	639	733	735
Unemployment rate	14.1	11.8	11.1	14.6	11.6	11.2	10.2	11.3	11.5

[1] The population figures are not adjusted for seasonal variation; therefore, identical numbers appear in the unadjusted and seasonally adjusted columns.

[2] Civilian employment as a percent of the civilian noninstitutional population.

NOTE: Detail for the above race and Hispanic-origin groups will not sum to totals because data for the "other races" group are not presented and Hispanics are included in both the white and black population groups.

Table A-4. Selected employment indicators

(Numbers in thousands)

Category	Not seasonally adjusted			Seasonally adjusted					
	Apr. 1983	Mar. 1984	Apr. 1984	Apr. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984	Feb. 1984	Mar. 1984	Apr. 1984
CHARACTERISTIC									
Civilian employed, 16 years and over	98,840	102,770	103,628	99,606	102,941	103,190	103,892	104,140	104,402
Married men, spouse present	37,335	38,699	38,789	37,602	38,496	38,682	38,911	38,927	39,062
Married women, spouse present	24,444	25,340	25,533	24,364	25,140	24,947	25,212	25,239	25,457
Women who maintain families	4,969	5,417	5,486	4,969	5,254	5,293	5,346	5,444	5,491
MAJOR INDUSTRY AND CLASS OF WORKER									
Agriculture:									
Wage and salary workers	1,452	1,260	1,526	1,578	1,512	1,483	1,560	1,515	1,661
Self-employed workers	1,581	1,446	1,485	1,595	1,572	1,613	1,609	1,580	1,534
Unpaid family workers	192	158	181	219	265	233	232	198	207
Nonagricultural industries:									
Wage and salary workers	87,781	91,874	92,243	88,390	91,422	91,641	92,379	92,819	92,931
Government	15,782	16,082	16,052	15,524	15,481	15,535	15,822	15,883	15,784
Private industries	71,999	75,792	76,191	72,866	75,941	76,106	76,557	77,006	77,147
Private households	1,163	1,111	1,238	1,221	1,291	1,397	1,279	1,155	1,296
Other industries	70,836	74,681	74,957	71,645	74,700	74,909	75,339	75,851	75,851
Self-employed workers	7,513	7,670	7,850	7,504	7,734	7,936	7,849	7,755	7,836
Unpaid family workers	360	354	343	354	450	364	330	326	338
PERSONS AT WORK[1]									
Nonagricultural industries	92,008	95,623	96,692	92,233	95,173	94,707	95,067	96,982	96,918
Full-time schedules	73,005	76,850	77,650	73,567	75,802	76,237	76,715	77,004	78,276
Part time for economic reasons	5,589	5,319	5,132	6,077	5,742	5,943	5,808	5,463	5,593
Usually work full time	1,841	1,496	1,492	1,888	1,672	1,771	1,691	1,472	1,530
Usually work part time	3,748	3,823	3,640	4,189	4,040	4,172	4,197	3,991	4,063
Part time for noneconomic reasons	13,440	13,454	13,910	12,589	12,659	12,527	12,565	12,515	13,049

[1] Excludes persons "with a job but not at work" during the survey period for such reasons as vacation, illness, or industrial dispute.

Table A-8. Range of unemployment measures based on varying definitions of unemployment and the labor force, seasonally adjusted

(Percent)

Measure	Quarterly averages					Monthly data		
	1983				1984	1984		
	I	II	III	IV	I	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.
U-1 Persons unemployed 15 weeks or longer as a percent of the civilian labor force	4.2	4.0	3.7	3.1	2.7	2.6	2.5	2.5
U-2 Job losers as a percent of the civilian labor force	6.2	6.0	5.4	4.7	4.2	4.2	4.1	4.0
U-3 Unemployed persons 25 years and over as a percent of the civilian labor force	7.1	7.0	7.3	6.6	6.4	6.0	5.9	6.0
U-4 Unemployed full-time jobseekers as a percent of the full-time civilian labor force	10.3	10.0	9.3	8.3	7.6	7.5	7.5	7.6
U-5a Total unemployed as a percent of the labor force, including the resident Armed Forces	10.2	10.0	9.3	8.4	7.8	7.7	7.7	7.7
U-5b Total unemployed as a percent of the civilian labor force	10.4	10.1	9.4	8.5	7.9	7.8	7.8	7.8
U-6 Total full-time jobseekers plus ½ part-time jobseekers plus ½ total on part time for economic reasons as a percent of the civilian labor force less ½ of the part-time labor force	13.4	12.9	12.2	11.2	10.5	10.4	10.3	10.4
U-7 Total full-time jobseekers plus ½ part-time jobseekers plus ½ total on part time for economic reasons plus discouraged workers as a percent of the civilian labor force plus discouraged workers less ½ of the part-time labor force	14.9	14.4	13.5	12.4	11.6	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.

N.A. = not available.

HOUSEHOLD DATA

Table A-6. Selected unemployment indicators, seasonally adjusted

Category	Number of unemployed persons (in thousands)			Unemployment rates[1]					
	Apr. 1983	Mar. 1984	Apr. 1984	Apr. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984	Feb. 1984	Mar. 1984	Apr. 1984
CHARACTERISTIC									
Total, 16 years and over	11,369	8,772	8,843	10.2	8.2	8.0	7.9	7.8	7.8
Men, 16 years and over	6,722	4,867	4,949	10.7	8.3	8.1	7.8	7.7	7.7
Men, 20 years and over	5,682	4,020	4,095	9.7	7.4	7.3	7.0	6.8	6.9
Women, 16 years and over	4,647	3,905	3,924	9.6	8.1	7.9	7.8	7.9	7.9
Women, 20 years and over	3,780	3,446	3,486	8.5	7.1	7.1	6.9	6.9	7.0
Both sexes, 16 to 19 years	1,907	1,608	1,562	23.4	20.1	19.4	19.3	19.9	19.4
Married men, spouse present	2,877	1,940	1,923	7.1	5.2	5.0	4.9	4.7	4.7
Married women, spouse present	1,933	1,560	1,566	7.0	6.1	6.0	5.9	5.8	5.8
Women who maintain families	744	673	645	13.0	10.9	10.7	11.0	11.0	10.5
Full-time workers	9,727	7,304	7,398	10.2	8.0	7.8	7.5	7.5	7.6
Part-time workers	1,636	1,465	1,443	10.5	9.8	9.7	9.3	9.2	9.1
Labor force time lost[2]	--	--	--	11.5	8.4	9.2	8.9	8.8	8.9
INDUSTRY									
Nonagricultural private wage and salary workers	8,576	6,389	6,442	10.5	8.3	7.9	7.8	7.6	7.7
Mining	228	102	100	20.3	12.4	10.9	12.2	11.2	10.3
Construction	1,071	776	795	20.0	16.3	15.0	15.4	13.3	14.3
Manufacturing	2,734	1,651	1,697	12.5	8.3	8.4	7.5	7.5	7.7
Durable goods	1,776	1,008	977	13.7	8.3	8.0	7.3	7.8	7.5
Nondurable goods	958	643	719	10.8	8.2	8.9	7.8	7.2	8.0
Transportation and public utilities	435	297	320	7.7	6.5	5.1	5.9	5.0	5.4
Wholesale and retail trade	2,163	1,768	1,857	10.4	8.8	8.4	8.3	8.3	8.7
Finance and service industries	1,952	1,765	1,674	7.3	6.6	6.3	6.3	6.4	6.1
Government workers	948	736	721	5.8	5.0	5.0	4.5	4.4	4.4
Agricultural wage and salary workers	319	260	231	16.8	15.6	15.5	14.0	14.6	12.2

[1] Unemployment as a percent of the civilian labor force.

[2] Aggregate hours lost by the unemployed and persons on part time for economic reasons as a percent of potentially available labor force hours.

Table A-7. Duration of unemployment

(Numbers in thousands)

Weeks of unemployment	Not seasonally adjusted			Seasonally adjusted					
	Apr. 1983	Jan. 1984	Apr. 1984	Apr. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984	Feb. 1984	Mar. 1984	Apr. 1984
DURATION									
Less than 5 weeks	3,118	2,983	2,981	3,595	3,382	3,233	3,359	3,386	3,430
5 to 14 weeks	2,772	2,735	2,206	3,439	2,504	2,556	2,484	2,539	2,493
15 weeks and over	5,145	3,339	3,337	4,396	3,369	3,201	2,984	2,873	2,855
15 to 26 weeks	2,184	1,417	1,431	1,691	1,206	1,166	1,173	1,114	1,111
27 weeks and over	2,964	1,923	1,906	2,705	2,085	2,035	1,880	1,759	1,744
Average (mean) duration, in weeks	24.3	20.2	20.5	19.2	19.6	20.5	18.8	18.8	18.5
Median duration, in weeks	13.3	10.3	10.0	10.8	9.0	9.2	8.3	8.3	8.1
PERCENT DISTRIBUTION									
Total unemployed	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Less than 5 weeks	28.3	32.9	35.0	32.3	36.5	36.0	38.1	38.5	39.1
5 to 14 weeks	25.1	30.2	25.9	28.2	27.1	28.4	28.1	28.9	28.4
15 weeks and over	46.6	36.9	39.2	39.5	36.4	35.6	33.8	32.7	32.5
15 to 26 weeks	19.8	15.6	16.8	15.2	13.9	13.0	13.3	12.7	12.6
27 weeks and over	26.8	21.2	22.4	24.3	22.5	22.6	20.5	20.0	19.8

Table A-8. Reason for unemployment

(Numbers in thousands)

Reason	Not seasonally adjusted			Seasonally adjusted					
	Apr. 1983	Mar. 1984	Apr. 1984	Apr. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984	Feb. 1984	Mar. 1984	Apr. 1984
NUMBER OF UNEMPLOYED									
Job losers	6,872	5,089	4,599	6,767	5,017	4,825	4,737	4,644	4,527
On layoff	1,940	1,452	1,087	1,979	1,283	1,238	1,272	1,254	1,108
Other job losers	4,932	3,637	3,512	4,788	3,734	3,588	3,465	3,390	3,419
Job leavers	760	730	727	816	855	809	772	756	788
Reentrants	2,274	2,157	2,407	2,494	2,246	2,192	2,153	2,208	2,308
New entrants	1,129	1,082	1,092	1,251	1,150	1,175	1,092	1,213	1,216
PERCENT DISTRIBUTION									
Total unemployed	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Job losers	62.3	56.2	53.9	59.8	54.1	53.6	54.8	52.5	51.3
On layoff	17.6	16.0	12.7	17.5	13.8	13.7	14.5	14.3	12.5
Other job losers	44.7	40.2	41.2	42.3	40.3	39.9	39.6	38.2	38.7
Job leavers	6.9	8.1	8.5	7.2	9.2	9.0	8.8	8.6	8.8
Reentrants	20.6	23.8	28.7	22.0	24.2	24.4	24.6	25.1	26.1
New entrants	10.2	11.9	12.8	11.0	12.4	13.1	12.5	13.8	13.8
UNEMPLOYED AS A PERCENT OF THE CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE									
Job losers	6.3	4.6	4.1	6.1	4.5	4.3	4.2	4.1	4.0
Job leavers	.7	.7	.6	.7	.8	.7	.7	.7	.7
Reentrants	2.1	1.9	1.9	2.2	2.0	2.0	1.9	2.0	2.0
New entrants	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.1	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.1	1.1

Table A-9. Unemployed persons by sex and age, seasonally adjusted

Sex and age	Number of unemployed persons (in thousands)			Unemployment rates[1]					
	Apr. 1983	Mar. 1984	Apr. 1984	Apr. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984	Feb. 1984	Mar. 1984	Apr. 1984
Total, 16 years and over	11,369	8,772	8,843	10.2	8.2	8.0	7.8	7.8	7.8
16 to 24 years	4,381	3,467	3,522	48.1	14.9	14.8	14.2	14.4	14.6
16 to 19 years	1,907	1,608	1,562	23.4	20.1	19.4	19.3	19.9	19.4
16 to 17 years	798	712	683	25.8	22.9	21.9	22.1	23.1	22.3
18 to 19 years	1,106	906	876	24.9	18.8	17.6	17.5	18.1	17.5
20 to 24 years	2,474	1,859	1,960	15.4	12.2	12.5	10.6	11.6	12.2
25 years and over	6,956	5,279	5,301	8.0	6.4	6.2	6.1	5.9	6.0
25 to 54 years	6,106	4,647	4,663	8.5	6.8	6.5	6.4	6.3	6.3
55 years and over	825	643	621	5.5	4.9	4.7	4.3	4.3	4.2
Men, 16 years and over	6,722	4,867	4,919	10.7	8.3	8.1	7.8	7.7	7.7
16 to 24 years	2,504	1,869	1,925	19.5	15.6	15.6	14.6	14.6	15.0
16 to 19 years	1,040	847	824	29.4	20.4	20.8	19.7	20.8	19.7
16 to 17 years	432	376	378	26.9	23.3	21.6	21.6	23.0	23.7
18 to 19 years	610	472	448	22.9	18.9	19.6	18.1	18.2	17.3
20 to 24 years	1,464	1,022	1,101	17.0	13.3	13.1	12.1	11.9	12.7
25 years and over	4,213	2,988	2,996	8.4	6.5	6.2	6.0	5.9	5.9
25 to 54 years	3,646	2,569	2,604	8.9	6.7	6.6	6.4	6.1	6.2
55 years and over	549	408	382	6.1	5.4	4.8	4.5	4.6	4.4
Women, 16 years and over	4,647	3,905	3,924	9.6	8.1	7.9	7.8	7.9	7.9
16 to 24 years	1,880	1,598	1,597	16.6	14.0	13.9	13.7	14.2	14.1
16 to 19 years	867	764	738	22.3	19.8	18.0	18.9	19.0	19.0
16 to 17 years	366	336	305	24.7	22.5	22.2	22.6	23.4	20.8
18 to 19 years	496	432	420	20.7	18.7	15.4	16.9	18.4	17.8
20 to 24 years	1,013	837	859	13.6	11.0	11.7	11.0	11.3	11.6
25 years and over	2,743	2,294	2,305	7.5	6.3	6.2	6.1	6.0	6.0
25 to 54 years	2,460	2,078	2,059	8.0	6.8	6.5	6.5	6.5	6.4
55 years and over	276	235	239	4.6	4.3	4.5	4.0	3.9	3.9

[1] Unemployment as a percent of the civilian labor force.

Table A-10. Employment status of black and other workers

[Numbers in thousands]

Employment status	Not seasonally adjusted			Seasonally adjusted[1]					
	Apr. 1983	Mar. 1984	Apr. 1984	Apr. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984	Feb. 1984	Mar. 1984	Apr. 1984
Civilian noninstitutional population	23,276	23,539	23,791	23,276	23,437	23,594	23,680	23,539	23,791
Civilian labor force	14,248	14,314	14,528	14,487	14,539	14,425	14,593	14,521	14,770
Participation rate	61.2	60.8	61.1	62.2	62.0	61.1	61.6	61.7	62.1
Employed	11,624	12,151	12,384	11,776	12,179	12,479	12,417	12,325	12,541
Employment-population ratio[2]	49.9	51.6	52.1	50.6	51.5	51.6	52.6	52.4	52.7
Unemployed	2,620	2,163	2,144	2,711	2,358	2,246	2,176	2,195	2,229
Unemployment rate	18.4	15.1	14.8	18.7	16.2	15.6	14.9	15.1	15.1
Not in labor force	9,033	9,225	9,263	8,789	9,099	9,169	9,007	9,018	9,021

[1] The population figures are not adjusted for seasonal variation; therefore, identical numbers appear in the unadjusted and seasonally adjusted columns.

[2] Civilian employment as a percent of the civilian noninstitutional population.

Table A-11. Occupational status of the employed and unemployed, not seasonally adjusted

[Numbers in thousands]

Occupation	Civilian employed		Unemployed		Unemployment rate	
	Apr. 1983	Apr. 1984	Apr. 1983	Apr. 1984	Apr. 1983	Apr. 1984
Total, 16 years and over[1]	98,840	103,628	11,035	8,525	10.0	7.6
Managerial and professional specialty	23,865	24,977	829	564	3.4	2.2
Executive, administrative, and managerial	10,813	11,373	441	298	3.9	2.6
Professional specialty	12,992	13,603	388	266	2.9	1.9
Technical, sales, and administrative support	30,601	32,020	2,060	1,683	6.3	5.0
Technicians and related support	2,990	3,060	131	87	4.2	2.8
Sales occupations	14,432	12,351	870	711	7.1	5.4
Administrative support, including clerical	16,180	16,609	4,060	885	6.1	5.1
Service occupations	13,407	14,024	1,700	1,424	11.3	9.2
Private household	936	1,004	67	67	6.7	6.3
Protective service	1,562	1,604	116	89	6.9	5.3
Service, except private household and protective	10,940	11,417	1,517	1,268	12.2	10.0
Precision production, craft, and repair	11,881	12,778	1,662	1,130	12.3	8.1
Mechanics and repairers	4,021	4,368	408	265	9.2	5.7
Construction trades	4,063	4,382	813	598	16.7	12.0
Other precision production, craft, and repair	3,796	4,021	441	267	10.4	6.2
Operators, fabricators, and laborers	15,641	16,486	3,194	2,237	17.0	11.9
Machine operators, assemblers, and inspectors	7,530	7,897	1,536	949	16.9	10.7
Transportation and material moving occupations	4,077	4,422	657	455	13.9	9.3
Handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers, and laborers	4,034	4,167	1,001	833	19.9	16.7
Construction laborers	528	591	263	203	33.2	25.6
Other handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers, and laborers	3,506	3,576	738	630	17.4	15.0
Farming, forestry, and fishing	3,503	3,349	395	317	10.1	8.6

[1] Persons with no previous work experience and those whose last job was in the Armed Forces are included in the unemployed total.

Table A-12. Employment status of male Vietnam-era veterans and nonveterans by age, not seasonally adjusted

(Numbers in thousands)

Veteran status and age	Civilian noninstitutional population		Civilian labor force							
			Total		Employed		Unemployed			
							Number		Percent of labor force	
	Apr. 1983	Apr. 1984	Apr. 1983	Apr. 1984	Apr. 1983	Apr. 1984	Apr. 1983	Apr. 1984	Apr. 1983	Apr. 1984
VETERANS										
Total, 25 years and over	7,837	7,918	7,292	7,402	6,620	6,957	672	445	9.2	6.0
25 to 30 years	5,944	5,583	5,639	5,332	5,085	4,972	554	360	9.8	6.8
25 to 29 years	718	524	662	496	561	424	101	72	15.3	14.5
30 to 34 years	2,244	1,849	2,405	1,705	2,085	1,600	220	105	10.5	6.2
35 to 39 years	2,982	3,240	2,872	3,131	2,639	2,948	233	183	8.1	5.8
40 years and over	1,893	2,335	1,653	2,070	1,535	1,985	118	85	7.1	4.1
NONVETERANS										
Total, 25 to 39 years	19,808	20,872	18,726	19,662	16,843	18,278	1,913	1,384	10.2	7.0
25 to 29 years	8,647	8,902	8,124	8,307	7,094	7,667	1,030	640	12.7	7.7
30 to 34 years	6,664	7,269	6,318	6,884	5,789	6,639	529	445	8.4	6.5
35 to 39 years	4,497	4,701	4,284	4,471	3,930	4,172	354	299	8.3	6.7

NOTE: Male Vietnam-era veterans are men who served in the Armed Forces between August 5, 1964 and May 7, 1975. Nonveterans are men who have never served in the Armed Forces; published data are limited to those 25 to 39 years of age, the group that most closely corresponds to the bulk of the Vietnam-era veteran population.

HOUSEHOLD DATA

Table A-13. Employment status of the civilian population for ten large States

(Numbers in thousands)

State and employment status	Not seasonally adjusted[1]			Seasonally adjusted[2]					
	Apr. 1983	Mar. 1984	Apr. 1984	Apr. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984	Feb. 1984	Mar. 1984	Apr. 1984
California									
Civilian noninstitutional population	18,729	19,035	19,061	18,729	18,954	18,983	19,009	19,035	19,061
Civilian labor force	12,111	12,366	12,373	12,192	12,389	12,395	12,363	12,431	12,458
Employed	10,910	11,302	11,421	10,992	11,388	11,350	11,380	11,425	11,504
Unemployed	1,201	1,065	952	1,200	1,001	1,045	983	1,026	954
Unemployment rate	9.9	8.6	7.7	9.8	8.1	8.4	8.0	8.2	7.7
Florida									
Civilian noninstitutional population	8,299	8,491	8,509	8,299	8,435	8,455	8,473	8,491	8,509
Civilian labor force	4,726	4,980	4,933	4,791	5,097	5,067	5,065	5,105	5,004
Employed	4,331	4,713	4,649	4,368	4,717	4,713	4,760	4,826	4,694
Unemployed	395	267	283	423	380	354	305	279	310
Unemployment rate	8.4	5.4	5.7	8.8	7.5	7.0	6.0	5.5	6.2
Illinois									
Civilian noninstitutional population	8,571	8,591	8,592	8,571	8,586	8,588	8,590	8,591	8,592
Civilian labor force	5,555	5,569	5,533	5,602	5,540	5,553	5,599	5,625	5,579
Employed	4,894	4,976	5,005	4,910	5,008	5,005	5,067	5,036	5,021
Unemployed	661	592	527	692	532	548	532	589	558
Unemployment rate	11.9	10.6	9.5	12.4	9.6	9.9	9.5	10.5	10.0
Massachusetts									
Civilian noninstitutional population	4,479	4,503	4,505	4,479	4,497	4,499	4,501	4,503	4,505
Civilian labor force	2,929	3,002	3,036	2,989	3,017	3,028	3,033	3,026	3,099
Employed	2,733	2,826	2,883	2,779	2,823	2,831	2,860	2,865	2,932
Unemployed	196	175	153	210	194	197	173	161	167
Unemployment rate	6.7	5.8	5.0	7.0	6.4	6.5	5.7	5.3	5.4
Michigan									
Civilian noninstitutional population	6,748	6,731	6,729	6,748	6,737	6,736	6,733	6,731	6,729
Civilian labor force	4,301	4,296	4,331	4,350	4,241	4,207	4,305	4,385	4,377
Employed	3,633	3,757	3,852	3,695	3,748	3,772	3,815	3,891	3,911
Unemployed	668	539	479	655	493	435	490	494	466
Unemployment rate	15.5	12.5	11.0	15.1	11.6	11.5	11.4	11.3	10.6
New Jersey									
Civilian noninstitutional population	5,739	5,783	5,786	5,739	5,772	5,776	5,779	5,783	5,786
Civilian labor force	3,605	3,800	3,892	3,644	3,762	3,774	3,811	3,822	3,928
Employed	3,337	3,518	3,636	3,365	3,503	3,503	3,575	3,565	3,661
Unemployed	268	282	256	279	259	271	236	257	267
Unemployment rate	7.4	7.4	6.6	7.7	6.9	7.2	6.2	6.7	6.8
New York									
Civilian noninstitutional population	13,545	13,613	13,618	13,545	13,599	13,605	13,609	13,613	13,618
Civilian labor force	7,953	8,076	7,936	8,008	8,056	7,939	8,024	8,061	7,994
Employed	7,240	7,458	7,420	7,278	7,455	7,353	7,432	7,501	7,461
Unemployed	713	618	516	730	601	586	592	560	533
Unemployment rate	9.0	7.7	6.5	9.1	7.5	7.4	7.4	6.9	6.7
Ohio									
Civilian noninstitutional population	8,049	8,050	8,049	8,049	8,050	8,050	8,050	8,050	8,049
Civilian labor force	5,076	4,940	4,996	5,134	5,097	5,095	5,082	5,025	5,050
Employed	4,425	4,615	4,506	4,463	4,561	4,619	4,607	4,513	4,543
Unemployed	651	325	489	671	536	476	475	512	507
Unemployment rate	12.8	10.6	9.8	13.1	10.5	9.3	9.3	10.2	10.0
Pennsylvania									
Civilian noninstitutional population	9,177	9,202	9,203	9,177	9,196	9,198	9,200	9,202	9,203
Civilian labor force	5,361	5,278	5,317	5,413	5,519	5,451	5,421	5,365	5,394
Employed	4,649	4,772	4,829	4,713	4,943	4,997	4,888	4,887	4,900
Unemployed	693	506	488	700	576	454	533	478	494
Unemployment rate	13.0	9.6	9.2	12.9	10.4	8.3	9.8	8.9	9.2
Texas									
Civilian noninstitutional population	11,203	11,480	11,506	11,203	11,402	11,429	11,455	11,480	11,506
Civilian labor force	7,534	7,790	7,821	7,370	7,743	7,648	7,632	7,817	7,854
Employed	6,927	7,281	7,317	6,932	7,146	7,118	7,199	7,307	7,322
Unemployed	608	509	504	438	597	530	433	510	532
Unemployment rate	8.1	6.5	6.4	8.4	7.7	6.9	5.7	6.5	6.8

[1] These are the official Bureau of Labor Statistics' estimates used in the administration of Federal fund allocation programs.

[2] The population figures are not adjusted for seasonal variation; therefore, identical numbers appear in the unadjusted and the seasonally adjusted columns.

ESTABLISHMENT DATA

Table B-1. Employees on nonagricultural payrolls by industry

(In thousands)

Industry	Not seasonally adjusted				Seasonally adjusted					
	Apr. 1983	Feb. 1984	Mar. 1984 p	Apr. 1984 p	Apr. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984	Feb. 1984	Mar. 1984 p	Apr. 1984 p
Total	89,003	91,140	91,803	92,808	89,090	91,599	91,930	92,357	92,506	92,913
Total private	72,984	75,121	75,720	76,741	73,377	75,829	76,188	76,584	76,750	77,136
Goods-producing	22,936	24,123	24,329	24,725	23,159	24,415	24,617	24,784	24,783	24,966
Mining	991	1,039	1,044	1,055	997	1,047	1,051	1,052	1,053	1,061
Oil and gas extraction	617.9	657.0	653.6	658.5	625	663	662	661	662	663
Construction	3,650	3,772	3,828	4,091	3,786	4,088	4,177	4,233	4,170	4,244
General building contractors	926.9	1,006.9	1,029.0	1,073.7	968	1,075	1,108	1,115	1,112	1,121
Manufacturing	18,295	19,312	19,457	19,579	18,376	19,280	19,389	19,499	19,560	19,661
Production workers	12,369	13,241	13,366	13,480	12,435	13,230	13,322	13,402	13,451	13,546
Durable goods	10,687	11,473	11,591	11,680	10,689	11,406	11,477	11,572	11,621	11,683
Production workers	7,038	7,716	7,819	7,899	7,035	7,663	7,725	7,801	7,838	7,894
Lumber and wood products	640.3	694.1	705.5	718.7	651	713	717	719	726	730
Furniture and fixtures	440.1	482.7	484.0	485.2	440	473	477	483	486	485
Stone, clay, and glass products	559.9	574.6	584.6	597.1	565	589	593	602	603	603
Primary metal industries	828.5	875.2	882.2	890.9	820	881	872	878	876	882
Blast furnaces and basic steel products	336.2	338.6	340.1	344.5	333	343	336	337	337	341
Fabricated metal products	1,367.3	1,436.2	1,467.9	1,472.4	1,369	1,449	1,458	1,464	1,471	1,474
Machinery, except electrical	2,043.6	2,207.6	2,231.9	2,250.1	2,031	2,172	2,187	2,203	2,216	2,237
Electrical and electronic equipment	1,994.6	2,179.9	2,202.2	2,216.5	1,999	2,146	2,165	2,191	2,211	2,221
Transportation equipment	1,746.3	1,910.9	1,933.2	1,944.5	1,743	1,887	1,909	1,928	1,925	1,941
Motor vehicles and equipment	741.1	863.2	874.2	878.8	743	846	871	879	875	881
Instruments and related products	688.8	703.9	706.7	708.1	690	701	706	707	710	710
Miscellaneous manufacturing	377.9	387.8	392.7	396.7	381	393	393	397	397	400
Nondurable goods	7,608	7,839	7,866	7,899	7,687	7,874	7,912	7,927	7,939	7,978
Production workers	5,331	5,525	5,547	5,581	5,400	5,565	5,597	5,601	5,613	5,652
Food and kindred products	1,565.6	1,582.0	1,580.1	1,587.7	1,633	1,632	1,642	1,639	1,637	1,656
Tobacco manufactures	61.4	60.6	59.5	59.5	66	62	61	61	62	64
Textile mill products	733.0	760.7	762.9	764.2	733	759	766	764	766	764
Apparel and other textile products	1,148.5	1,209.6	1,216.5	1,221.5	1,149	1,206	1,210	1,213	1,217	1,222
Paper and allied products	651.8	668.4	670.7	671.4	654	670	671	674	675	673
Printing and publishing	1,274.3	1,314.4	1,321.0	1,328.9	1,274	1,303	1,310	1,313	1,317	1,329
Chemicals and allied products	1,055.7	1,060.5	1,064.0	1,066.6	1,058	1,064	1,065	1,065	1,065	1,069
Petroleum and coal products	196.9	187.1	187.5	189.8	199	192	192	192	191	192
Rubber and miscellaneous plastics products	707.4	782.1	790.8	796.1	707	769	777	788	795	795
Leather and leather products	213.6	214.0	212.6	213.7	214	217	218	218	216	214
Service-producing	66,069	67,017	67,474	68,083	65,931	67,184	67,313	67,573	67,723	67,947
Transportation and public utilities	4,953	4,992	5,017	5,049	4,988	5,015	5,057	5,063	5,073	5,085
Transportation	2,698	2,746	2,769	2,797	2,721	2,747	2,792	2,801	2,809	2,822
Communication and public utilities	2,256	2,246	2,248	2,252	2,267	2,269	2,266	2,262	2,264	2,263
Wholesale trade	5,164	5,315	5,350	5,379	5,180	5,313	5,343	5,363	5,382	5,395
Durable goods	3,023	3,147	3,169	3,187	3,022	3,133	3,150	3,166	3,179	3,186
Nondurable goods	2,141	2,168	2,181	2,192	2,158	2,182	2,194	2,197	2,203	2,209
Retail trade	15,013	15,119	15,219	15,453	15,149	15,468	15,517	15,555	15,593	15,595
General merchandise stores	2,108.5	2,200.2	2,204.0	2,226.7	2,185	2,238	2,265	2,264	2,291	2,308
Food stores	2,452.9	2,505.2	2,501.5	2,515.0	2,475	2,509	2,528	2,536	2,537	2,538
Automotive dealers and service stations	1,595.2	1,642.1	1,652.2	1,669.3	1,598	1,639	1,649	1,663	1,669	1,673
Eating and drinking places	4,872.8	4,675.8	4,764.2	4,918.0	4,863	4,910	4,925	4,906	4,917	4,908
Finance, insurance, and real estate	5,401	5,523	5,547	5,577	5,423	5,523	5,533	5,570	5,580	5,599
Finance	2,688	2,777	2,787	2,791	2,695	2,767	2,772	2,783	2,789	2,797
Insurance	1,713	1,728	1,732	1,734	1,715	1,718	1,727	1,732	1,732	1,736
Real estate	1,000	1,020	1,029	1,053	1,012	1,040	1,033	1,054	1,059	1,066
Services	19,517	20,047	20,258	20,557	19,478	20,093	20,101	20,249	20,339	20,516
Business services	3,463.4	3,840.7	3,905.6	3,986.8	3,491	3,808	3,833	3,895	3,941	4,019
Health services	5,904.9	5,993.3	6,008.9	6,032.0	5,929	5,994	5,994	6,011	6,019	6,056
Government	16,021	16,019	16,083	16,066	15,713	15,770	15,742	15,773	15,756	15,757
Federal	2,735	2,746	2,750	2,762	2,738	2,768	2,762	2,760	2,761	2,765
State	3,722	3,748	3,763	3,756	3,633	3,646	3,643	3,668	3,665	3,666
Local	9,564	9,524	9,570	9,547	9,342	9,356	9,337	9,346	9,330	9,326

p = preliminary.

ESTABLISHMENT DATA

Table B-2. Average weekly hours of production or nonsupervisory workers[1] on private nonagricultural payrolls by industry

Industry	Not seasonally adjusted				Seasonally adjusted					
	Apr. 1983	Feb. 1984	Mar. 1984 p	Apr. 1984 p	Apr. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984	Feb. 1984	Mar. 1984 p	Apr. 1984 p
Total private	34.7	35.1	35.1	35.4	34.9	35.3	35.3	35.4	35.2	35.6
Mining	41.6	43.0	42.8	42.8	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Construction	36.7	37.0	36.7	37.7	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Manufacturing	39.8	40.7	40.7	40.9	40.1	40.5	41.0	41.0	40.6	41.2
Overtime hours	2.7	3.4	3.4	3.4	2.9	3.4	3.5	3.6	3.4	3.7
Durable goods	40.3	41.4	41.4	41.7	40.5	41.1	41.8	41.7	41.2	41.9
Overtime hours	2.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	2.8	3.5	3.7	3.7	3.6	3.9
Lumber and wood products	39.8	39.7	39.8	40.3	40.0	39.7	40.8	40.4	39.9	40.5
Furniture and fixtures	39.0	39.1	39.4	39.7	39.3	40.1	40.2	39.7	39.1	40.0
Stone, clay, and glass products	40.9r	41.5	41.5	42.4	41.0	41.6	42.3	42.6	41.7	42.5
Primary metal industries	40.1	42.0	42.0	42.2	39.9	41.8	41.9	43.0	41.7	42.0
Blast furnaces and basic steel products	39.2	41.2	41.1	41.2	37.9	41.3	40.8	41.1	40.8	39.9
Fabricated metal products	40.2	41.5	41.3	41.6	40.5	41.4	41.8	41.9	41.1	41.9
Machinery, except electrical	40.0	41.9	41.9	42.1	40.2	41.4	41.8	41.9	41.5	42.4
Electrical and electronic equipment	40.1	41.1	41.0	41.0	40.4	40.9	41.4	41.3	40.7	41.3
Transportation equipment	42.0	42.9	43.0	43.3	42.3	41.9	43.4	43.2	42.9	43.6
Motor vehicles and equipment	43.3	43.9	44.5	44.5	43.7	42.5	43.4	44.3	44.0	44.9
Instruments and related products	40.1	41.2	41.2	41.6	40.5	40.7	41.4	41.3	41.0	42.0
Miscellaneous manufacturing	39.0	39.6	39.3	39.9	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Nondurable goods	39.1	39.6	39.6	39.9	39.5	39.7	40.0	40.0	39.7	40.2
Overtime hours	2.7	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.0	3.2	3.2	3.3	3.2	3.4
Food and kindred products	38.9	39.2	39.3	39.5	39.6	39.4	39.6	39.8	39.7	40.2
Tobacco manufactures	37.3	36.3	37.0	38.1	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Textile mill products	40.2	40.6	40.6	40.9	40.6	40.7	41.1	40.9	40.5	41.3
Apparel and other textile products	35.9	36.7	36.7	36.9	36.2	36.5	37.3	37.1	36.6	37.2
Paper and allied products	42.2	42.9	42.7	43.0	42.4	43.0	43.2	43.3	42.8	43.2
Printing and publishing	37.4	37.6	38.0	38.1	37.7	37.6	37.9	37.9	37.8	38.4
Chemicals and allied products	41.5	42.0	41.8	41.9	41.5	41.9	42.2	42.2	41.8	41.9
Petroleum and coal products	43.8	43.5	43.5	43.1	43.5	44.7	45.1	44.6	44.3	42.8
Rubber and miscellaneous plastics products	41.1	42.0	41.7	42.2	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Leather and leather products	36.5	36.8	36.2	37.1	37.0	37.0	37.5	37.1	36.5	37.6
Transportation and public utilities	38.6	39.0	39.0	39.1	38.8	39.4	39.5	39.2	39.1	39.3
Wholesale trade	38.3	38.4	38.5	38.8	38.5	38.7	38.8	38.7	38.6	39.0
Retail trade	29.4	29.4	29.5	29.9	29.6	30.4	30.1	30.0	29.9	30.1
Finance, insurance, and real estate	36.1	36.3	36.3	36.6	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Services	32.6	32.6	32.6	32.8	32.7	32.6	32.8	32.7	32.7	32.9

[1] Data relate to production workers in mining and manufacturing; to construction workers in construction; and to nonsupervisory workers in transportation and public utilities; wholesale and retail trade; finance, insurance, and real estate; and services. These groups account for approximately four-fifths of the total employees on private nonagricultural payrolls.

[2] This series is not published seasonally adjusted since the seasonal component is small relative to the trend-cycle and/or irregular components and consequently cannot be separated with sufficient precision.

p = preliminary.

ESTABLISHMENT DATA

Table B-3. Average hourly and weekly earnings of production or nonsupervisory workers[1] on private nonagricultural payrolls by industry

Industry	Average hourly earnings				Average weekly earnings			
	Apr. 1983	Feb. 1984	Mar. 1984 p	Apr. 1984 p	Apr. 1983	Feb. 1984	Mar. 1984 p	Apr. 1984 p
Total private	$7.94	$8.24	$8.24	$8.29	$275.52	$289.22	$289.22	$293.47
Seasonally adjusted	7.95	8.23	8.25	8.30	277.46	291.34	290.40	295.48
Mining	11.28	11.51	11.63	11.63	469.25	494.93	497.76	497.76
Construction	11.90	11.98	11.97	11.92	436.73	443.26	439.30	449.38
Manufacturing	8.77	9.08	9.11	9.13	349.05	369.56	370.78	373.42
Durable goods	9.31	9.66	9.68	9.70	375.19	399.92	400.75	404.49
Lumber and wood products	7.74	7.89	7.86	7.93	308.05	313.23	312.83	319.58
Furniture and fixtures	6.51	6.74	6.76	6.76	253.89	263.53	266.34	268.37
Stone, clay, and glass products	9.16	9.39	9.41	9.52	374.64	389.69	390.52	403.65
Primary metal industries	11.25	11.49	11.43	11.49	451.13	482.58	480.06	484.88
Blast furnaces and basic steel products	12.77	13.13	12.99	13.12	500.58	540.96	533.89	540.54
Fabricated metal products	9.07	9.34	9.34	9.36	364.61	387.61	385.74	389.38
Machinery, except electrical	9.48	9.96	9.95	9.97	379.20	416.49	416.91	419.74
Electrical and electronic equipment	8.60	8.87	8.90	8.91	344.86	364.56	364.90	365.31
Transportation equipment	11.53	12.02	12.14	12.12	484.26	515.66	522.02	524.80
Motor vehicles and equipment	11.99	12.43	12.65	12.62	519.17	545.68	562.93	561.59
Instruments and related products	8.46	8.72	8.76	8.82	339.25	359.26	360.91	366.91
Miscellaneous manufacturing	6.76	6.99	6.99	6.98	263.64	276.80	276.11	278.50
Nondurable goods	8.03	8.24	8.26	8.28	313.97	326.30	327.10	330.37
Food and kindred products	8.20	8.34	8.37	8.41	318.98	326.93	328.94	332.20
Tobacco manufactures	10.61	11.09	11.21	11.39	395.75	402.57	414.77	433.96
Textile mill products	6.14	6.41	6.43	6.44	246.83	260.25	261.06	263.40
Apparel and other textile products	5.35	5.46	5.47	5.48	192.07	200.38	200.75	202.21
Paper and allied products	9.72	10.21	10.25	10.30	410.18	438.01	437.68	442.90
Printing and publishing	9.03	9.32	9.31	9.30	337.72	350.43	353.78	354.33
Chemicals and allied products	10.43	10.89	10.92	10.98	432.85	457.38	456.46	460.06
Petroleum and coal products	13.27	13.43	13.44	13.35	581.23	584.21	584.64	575.39
Rubber and miscellaneous plastics products	7.95	8.20	8.22	8.27	326.75	344.40	342.77	348.99
Leather and leather products	5.52	5.66	5.67	5.68	201.48	208.29	205.23	210.73
Transportation and public utilities	10.72	10.99	10.99	11.01	413.79	428.61	428.61	430.49
Wholesale trade	8.34	8.66	8.67	8.78	319.42	332.54	333.80	340.66
Retail trade	5.69	5.89	5.89	5.90	167.29	173.17	173.76	176.41
Finance, insurance, and real estate	7.23	7.54	7.54	7.54	261.00	273.70	273.70	275.96
Services	7.20	7.51	7.50	7.56	234.72	244.83	244.59	247.97

[1] See footnote 1, table B-2.

p = preliminary.

Table B-4. Hourly Earnings Index for production or nonsupervisory workers[1] on private nonagricultural payrolls by industry

(1977 = 100)

Industry	Not seasonally adjusted					Seasonally adjusted						
	Apr. 1983	Feb. 1984	Mar. 1984p	Apr. 1984p	Percent change from: Apr. 1983-Apr. 1984	Apr. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984	Feb. 1984	Mar. 1984p	Apr. 1984p	Percent change from: Mar. 1984-Apr. 1984
Total private nonfarm:												
Current dollars	154.0	158.6	158.7	159.5	3.6	154.0	157.6	158.3	158.2	158.8	159.6	0.5
Constant (1977) dollars	94.7	94.9	94.9	N.A.	(2)	94.7	94.7	94.7	94.6	94.9	N.A.	(3)
Mining	165.7	171.0	172.5	172.7	4.2	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)
Construction	144.3	145.2	145.2	145.0	.5	145.9	145.2	146.2	146.1	146.5	146.7	.1
Manufacturing	157.1	161.1	161.4	162.0	3.2	157.0	160.1	160.7	161.1	161.7	162.0	.2
Transportation and public utilities	155.5	160.0	158.9	160.2	3.1	155.9	158.9	160.0	159.3	160.8	160.7	-.1
Wholesale and retail trade	150.9	155.7	155.7	157.0	4.1	150.5	154.8	155.2	155.2	155.5	156.6	.7
Finance, insurance, and real estate	157.4	164.3	164.3	164.9	4.8	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)
Services	154.2	160.4	160.2	161.8	5.0	154.0	159.1	159.8	159.2	159.5	161.7	1.4

1 See footnote 1, table B-2.
2 Percent change is -.1 percent from March 1983 to March 1984, the latest month available.
3 Percent change is 0.3 percent from February 1984 to March 1984, the latest month available.
4 These series are not seasonally adjusted since the seasonal component is small relative to the trend-cycle and/or irregular components and consequently cannot be separated with sufficient precision.

N.A. = not available.
p = preliminary.

ESTABLISHMENT DA

Table B-5. Indexes of aggregate weekly hours of production or nonsupervisory workers[1] on private nonagricultural payrolls by industry

(1977 = 100)

Industry	Not seasonally adjusted				Seasonally adjusted					
	Apr. 1983	Feb. 1984	Mar. 1984 p	Apr. 1984 p	Apr. 1983	Dec. 1983	Jan. 1984	Feb. 1984	Mar. 1984 p	Apr. 1984
Total	102.8	106.9	107.9	110.2	104.0	108.9	110.1	110.4	109.9	111.5
Goods-producing	87.9	95.6	96.4	99.3	89.6	98.8	99.5	100.1	98.5	101.1
Mining	107.7	118.3	118.5	119.8	109.5	118.9	122.2	120.9	120.1	122.0
Construction	91.5	95.7	96.5	107.5	96.3	105.6	112.6	114.3	107.6	112.9
Manufacturing	86.3	94.5	95.3	96.7	87.4	96.0	95.9	96.4	95.7	97.9
Durable goods	83.3	93.9	95.1	96.7	83.7	92.6	94.7	95.6	94.8	97.2
Lumber and wood products	86.0	93.8	95.9	98.6	88.0	97.2	100.0	99.2	99.3	101.0
Furniture and fixtures	91.1	101.4	102.5	103.9	92.0	101.7	103.0	103.1	102.3	104.9
Stone, clay, and glass products	78.9	82.6	84.2	88.2	80.0	85.5	87.3	89.9	87.8	89.3
Primary metal industries	64.8	73.5	74.3	75.4	63.7	73.6	72.7	73.6	73.1	74.3
Blast furnaces and basic steel products	56.3	61.2	61.6	62.9	53.9	61.9	60.0	60.6	60.4	60.2
Fabricated metal products	80.7	90.2	90.7	91.9	81.4	89.4	91.0	91.7	90.6	92.6
Machinery, except electrical	80.3	94.5	96.1	97.5	80.0	91.0	92.9	94.2	94.2	97.3
Electrical and electronic equipment	96.7	110.9	112.1	113.2	97.6	108.1	110.7	111.8	111.3	114.0
Transportation equipment	83.4	96.2	97.7	99.0	83.7	92.5	97.4	98.0	96.7	99.4
Motor vehicles and equipment	74.6	91.2	93.8	94.0	75.6	86.1	93.3	93.6	94.5	95.2
Instruments and related products	100.6	106.3	106.8	107.8	101.9	104.3	107.1	107.2	r106.7	109.3
Miscellaneous manufacturing	81.5	85.6	86.6	88.8	82.9	87.2	87.3	88.8	87.2	90.4
Nondurable goods	90.8	95.3	95.7	96.9	92.8	96.1	97.6	97.6	96.9	98.9
Food and kindred products	89.2	91.1	91.2	92.3	96.0	95.6	97.1	97.0	96.8	99.5
Tobacco manufactures	80.4	76.3	76.0	77.9	89.1	82.8	83.1	79.1	82.3	87.4
Textile mill products	79.2	83.6	83.8	84.7	80.1	83.7	83.3	84.7	84.1	85.6
Apparel and other textile products	86.7	93.8	94.3	95.2	87.6	92.9	93.4	95.0	93.8	96.2
Paper and allied products	92.3	96.9	96.9	97.8	93.1	97.4	98.0	98.6	97.7	98.6
Printing and publishing	107.6	111.7	113.7	114.7	108.1	110.9	112.4	112.4	112.6	115.3
Chemicals and allied products	94.6	96.9	96.6	97.3	94.7	96.8	97.7	97.8	96.4	97.3
Petroleum and coal products	93.4	84.0	84.6	86.8	94.6	90.8	90.0	89.8	88.4	87.7
Rubber and miscellaneous plastics products	98.1	111.8	112.3	114.8	98.5	109.6	111.0	113.0	112.6	115.0
Leather and leather products	80.3	81.6	80.0	82.7	81.7	83.5	84.7	83.7	81.9	83.9
Service-producing	111.1	113.2	114.3	116.3	111.9	115.6	116.9	116.1	116.2	117.3
Transportation and public utilities	98.3	99.8	100.3	101.6	99.8	101.7	102.7	101.9	101.8	102.9
Wholesale trade	103.3	109.0	110.0	111.6	106.6	109.9	111.0	110.9	111.0	112.7
Retail trade	100.8	101.0	102.2	103.0	102.4	107.3	106.3	106.4	106.3	106.9
Finance, insurance, and real estate	117.1	120.4	120.7	122.7	117.8	120.5	121.9	121.5	121.5	123.3
Services	124.7	127.9	129.3	131.1	124.7	128.3	129.1	129.7	130.2	131.2

[1] See footnote 1, table B-2.

p = preliminary.

Table B-6. Indexes of diffusion: Percent of industries in which employment[1] increased

Time span	Year	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.
Over 1-month span	1982	28.5	45.4	36.0	39.0	47.6	32.8	38.4	37.1	34.1	29.3	32.0	42
	1983	56.5	45.7	62.4	69.1	71.0	64.5	68.5	68.0	60.8	70.7	64.5	64
	1984	66.9	72.0	66.9p	68.5p								
Over 3-month span	1982	25.3	28.8	32.0	34.1	32.5	33.6	27.2	27.2	26.1	25.5	24.7	40
	1983	45.4	35.1	63.6	75.8	76.1	77.2	73.9	79.6	79.6	74.2	72.0	75
	1984	79.3	80.1p	79.0p									
Over 6-month span	1982	20.2	23.7	25.3	29.8	26.1	26.1	23.4	19.1	21.2	26.1	26.6	35
	1983	50.5	63.2	73.4	76.3	79.3	83.6	82.5	80.4	82.0	84.1	83.1	80
	1984	81.5p											
Over 12-month span	1982	22.0	20.7	18.0	19.4	18.3	20.7	20.7	22.8	24.2	31.5	37.6	44
	1983	48.9	58.3	62.6	73.4	76.1	81.2	84.4	88.4	85.8p	87.6p		
	1984												

[1] Number of employees, seasonally adjusted for 1, 3, and 6 month spans, on payrolls of 186 private nonagricultural industries.

p = preliminary.

NOTE: Figures are the percent of industries with employment rising. (Half of t changed components are counted as rising.) Data are centered within the spans

Representative LUNGREN. Thank you, Madam Commissioner. I will yield myself 7 minutes to start off.

In your summary you say that strong employment growth continued in April, the workweek increased, and the unemployment rate held steady for the third month in a row.

In previous months you have described the recovery in employment conditions as widespread. Would that description still hold?

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes, I believe so. Our diffusion index suggests that almost 70 percent—68.5 percent of the industries—registered an increase in employment.

Representative LUNGREN. So is the fact that the employment gains are widespread be a factor that would help to reduce or diminish the probability of production bottlenecks and price increases?

Ms. NORWOOD. There is no direct evidence of bottlenecks. The capacity utilization figures suggest that we are now above 80 percent of capacity utilization in manufacturing. Part of that we should recognize, of course, comes from the fact that many companies have removed some of their less productive plant capacity by closing them down, and that has had an important effect on these capacity utilization figures which are now up so much.

My own view is that the kinds of problems we will be seeing will be primarily ones of matching occupational skills, since the very strong growth has been clearly in white collar jobs and there is still a lot of unemployment among blue collar workers, and of geographical mismatches. People who are unemployed may well not be in places where the jobs are.

Representative LUNGREN. You mentioned the average factory workweek being up for the month of April. What is the measurement in numbers for April?

Ms. NORWOOD. The factory workweek is extraordinarily high, at 41.2 hours. That is an extraordinarily high number and I think that it helps to explain why we have had a very slow recovery of employment in manufacturing.

Representative LUNGREN. Would that be an indication to you that we might expect a little more rapid growth of employment in manufacturing in the near term?

Ms. NORWOOD. Well, employers, of course, always prefer to spend money or hours before committing themselves to the increased labor costs that often come with adding new employees to the payroll. I think to me it suggests that we may be having a leaner kind of work force and perhaps a more productive environment, but I think we will need some more time to be able to tell that.

Representative LUNGREN. Every time that I'm asked by reporters to comment on unemployment statistics, we get into this seasonal adjustment and nonseasonal adjustment and, of course, we always do that and you've given us information here based on seasonal adjustment factors, so obviously it had an impact on this release.

But taking that into account, is there any doubt that the Bureau's data reflects strong improvement in the labor market conditions for the period we're talking about?

Ms. NORWOOD. There's certainly no question that the data for April, any way you look at them, show employment growth.

36-618 O 84 - 11

Representative LUNGREN. What is the employment-population ratio for April? Do you have that?

Ms. NORWOOD. 59.3 percent.

Representative LUNGREN. For the 17 months that we've had this recovery, that shows some improvement, does it not?

Ms. NORWOOD. Oh, yes. It's gone up about 2 percentage points over the year.

Representative LUNGREN. And what is the significance of that figure in terms of using it as an index of gauging improvement or unimprovement in the employment situation?

Ms. NORWOOD. Well, I think that what it's telling us is that about six out of every ten workers of working age have a job. It is a high figure by historical standards, but it is not the highest we have had. We had higher employment-population ratios in 1979.

Representative LUNGREN. You mentioned that the component of the unemployed that we categorize the number of persons on layoff from a former job declined and you indicated that this was a very cyclical category.

Is this one way of saying that this category of unemployed reacts very definitely to overall economic conditions? That is, if you have a recession that you would expect that to be felt directly there; and if you have recovery that is one category that you would expect to in a sense lead the recovery?

Ms. NORWOOD. Well, in our factories in particular people frequently are laid off for a while until employers determine what is happening. So to that extent, I think the statement is correct.

Obviously, some of those people who first were laid off later may move into the other job loser category and it is really the total category that is the important thing for us to look at. We do have 8.8 million people still unemployed.

Representative LUNGREN. Senator Proxmire.

Senator PROXMIRE. Commissioner Norwood, you noticed in my opening remarks that I call attention to the fact that we have had a steady level of unemployment for 3 months in a row and you did, too, in your opening statement. There are other indications that there might be a further increase in employment in the extension of the workweek and in the general demand we have in the economy and so forth.

Let me ask you, how long have you been in the Bureau of Labor Statistics? I don't mean as Commissioner, but in your career, how many years?

Ms. NORWOOD. Since 1963.

Senator PROXMIRE. Since 1963. And before that, I take it you were also playing with statistics and studying them?

Ms. NORWOOD. To some extent. I still play sometimes.

Senator PROXMIRE. Does this suggest to you, the fact that you have a flat unemployment rate for 3 months in a row following 14 or 15 months of improvement, that this may be a leveling off, that unemployment is likely not to fall much lower on the basis of your experience?

Ms. NORWOOD. Well, of course, anything is possible. I think what we are seeing is the pickup in the labor force that many of us had anticipated a good deal earlier. One of the reasons that we have had such a sharp decline in the unemployment rate since Novem-

ber 1982 is because until about the last 3 months the labor force has grown so slowly. The labor force now, it seems to me at least, to be growing at a more normal kind of rate.

I have always felt, and I believe I've told this committee, that we would be seeing women resuming their labor force activity, even though many of them in particular were out of the labor force during the recession and in the early days of the recovery. The economy is going to have to create a lot of jobs just to keep up with the labor force increases that we can generally expect from now on.

Senator PROXMIRE. Now the factory workweek is the highest in 20 years. That surprised me because we've had an overall, long-term decline in the factory workweek over the years, have we not?

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes.

Senator PROXMIRE. And to have now a situation where it's the highest in 20 years is really quite surprising to me. In the durable goods industry the workweek lengthened to 41.2 hours. In several subcategories, hours are much higher. Auto equipment, 44.9 hourly; machinery 42.4 hours, and so forth.

I read an analysis recently in the New York Times that one reason why automobile companies are not hiring more people and they are relying on overtime is because they feel they're pretty much at the peak of their sales now. What this analysis showed is that there's been a much sharper increase in the price of automobiles than in personal income. In fact, it was now 30 percent higher in relationship to personal income than it was about 2 or 3 years ago, and the feeling was that many people would drive their cars longer and not trade them in every 2 or 3 years, and that some people were just priced out of the market and wouldn't buy automobiles.

On the basis of that analysis, they felt that this very critical bellwether industry which accounts for so much of our employment—one job in six, directly or indirectly—and has such a pervasive effect, is likely to level off.

Do you feel that there's some wisdom in that or not?

Ms. NORWOOD. I believe I read some of the same articles, Senator Proxmire. There is a clear price problem with future sales of automobiles and some indication that there may be a less vigorous approach ahead. I don't know.

The motor vehicles industry, has recovered fully the number of people that they lost during the recession and then some. They are at about 140 percent of the level that they were at when the recession began. They are still somewhat below the 1979 levels, of course.

But the point is that there are still a lot of other factories in some other industries, particularly in the steel industry, which have not recovered very much.

I'm pleased to see in this month's data that there has been an increase in employment in machinery manufacturing. That's always rather slow to turn around and it has been slow now. We do have an increase of some 21,000 in machinery this month.

Senator PROXMIRE. As you know, there are two big factors, and many others I'm sure—two big factors in the number of jobs we have in this country in automobiles. One is the demand for auto-

mobiles and the other is the imports, and the imports have been increasing.

Just 2 days ago, the trade representative, Mr. Brock, indicated that this is the last year in which we are going to provide for protection against Japanese imports, and if we permit larger imports of automobiles, as we very well might, it would also seem that the sale of domestic cars and therefore the number of domestic jobs might not expand as rapidly.

Let me ask you this. During April, the labor force increased by 333,000 persons and you pointed out that that was a more normal rate of increase. You note that most of the recent entrants have been women and a much larger influx of women in the labor force than men.

What's prompted that, in your view?

Ms. NORWOOD. A whole series of social and economic conditions. Certainly, we have had an enormous increase in labor force participation by women in the 1960's and the 1970's. It slowed done a great deal during the recession and I think it's just beginning to pick up again, and I think we can expect it to continue. Women are in the labor force to stay in increasing numbers.

Senator PROXMIRE. In addition to the reduced number of young people in the population, has the labor force participation rates of teenagers and the 20 to 24 year olds been falling; and if so, why?

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes. The participation rate of teenagers certainly has been falling over the long term. There are fewer of them in the population now, which, of course, means less upward pressure on the unemployment rate. You should recognize that that's one of the differences between the period now and the periods of the past.

The labor force participation rate for teenagers is up over the year, although it remains below the rate in 1981 and earlier years.

I think the more important figure for teenagers is the employment-population ratios. At 43.8 percent for the month of April, this rate is higher than it has been since late 1981. However, we have had rates as high as over 49 percent in the employment-population ratio and, of course, the EP for our black youth is shockingly low.

Senator PROXMIRE. Well, my time is up, but let me just ask you. I understood you to indicate that the increase in the labor force is more normal and if that more normal increase continues it will be more difficult for us to reduce unemployment and it's more likely that unemployment would stay at this level or possibly increase?

Ms. NORWOOD. It will certainly take strong job growth.

Senator PROXMIRE. Thank you. I've got more questions but my time is up.

Representative LUNGREN. Thank you, Senator.

Just commenting on the continuing problem that we all recognize with black teenage unemployment, I thought it was interesting to note that the national organization that represents the black mayors of American just 2 weeks ago endorsed the concept of the youth opportunity wage to try and take a crack at that problem. I guess we all have been scratching our heads about how to resolve it.

Ms. Norwood, what happened to average hourly earnings in April?

Ms. NORWOOD. They rose some. What we have been seeing in average earnings in general is a deceleration in the rates of increase over time, but we have also been having a deceleration in prices, and so real earnings have generally been rising.

Representative LUNGREN. What about average weekly earnings? I asked you about hourly earnings. With the increase in the workweek in factories, what do we see as an average weekly earnings?

Ms. NORWOOD. Well, weekly earnings, of course, are up more than hourly earnings, particularly in manufacturing, because the workweek is up.

Representative LUNGREN. How does that compare to previous increases? Is that a significant increase that we've seen last month or is that part of a trend we have seen? How would you categorize it?

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes, I believe that's the case. I don't have the specific numbers here. Over the year, the average weekly earnings have gone up considerably in manufacturing.

Representative LUNGREN. In listening to some commentators comment on the combined economic indicators performance in the last month, some were talking about the fact that Easter occurred relatively late this year. Could that have any effect on the figures we're talking about here, for purposes of unemployment? Whatever effect it had, is it significant or does it give us any clue to the figures that we're looking at?

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes, it certainly does. The leading indicators' index has as one very important component, hours of work. Hours of work, as you recall, last month declined sharply and this month are way up. As we discussed with this committee last month, we did feel that that decline was not completely real and that we needed some more months to see what was happening to that trend, and I think we were right. So we should understand that that sharp decline in hours has had some downward effect on the leading indicators' index, and also on the industrial production index.

Representative LUNGREN. I understand that these data that we're looking at today reflect the labor market conditions for the week including April 12. What was the weather like during that week, and does that have any effect on particular industries and, if so, which industries?

Ms. NORWOOD. So far as we know, there was not any unusual weather during the period.

Representative LUNGREN. The consensus among private economists, as reported by the blue chip economic indicators is, as I stated in my opening statement, that the current economic expansion is likely to continue, but at a more moderate rate, through 1984 and 1985.

If they are correct in that general consensus, should we expect to see further gradual declines in unemployment and further gains in employment?

Ms. NORWOOD. We are having a somewhat more moderate rate of job growth than we had earlier in the recovery, even though it is true that the 400,000 increase shown by our establishment survey is quite large.

As you know, there is a considerable difference between the employment growth during the recovery in the two surveys and some

of that 400,000, I think, may well be a catchup of the business survey, and I should point out that we do expect next month to issue the establishment survey, or the business survey, benchmarked to updated universe totals, so that we expect that there will be some reduction in the gap between the two surveys.

I think the big issue, of course, will be the fact that you need to have job growth in order to compensate for what we would normally anticipate as an increase in the labor force, and in order to get a reduction in the unemployment rate, the job growth has to be larger than the increase in the labor force.

If you look at the increase in the household survey during the 17 months of the recession, we have increased employment by 5.4 million. That's a very large increase. Yet, even during that period, when the labor force, until the last 3 months, has grown fairly slowly, something like about half of that was necessary just to compensate for the labor force growth.

Representative LUNGREN. In prior appearances before this committee, particularly when we had the early months of the recovery, you cautioned us on a number of occasions that we might expect to see a plateauing for a while of the unemployment rate, or even an uptake of 1 or 2 or even three-tenths of 1 percentage point.

We now have reached a plateau, perhaps a little later than you suggested we might have seen it, but is this unusual, or is this something that we ought to expect in the normal course of a recovery?

Ms. NORWOOD. We do have, from time to time, periods when the unemployment rate remains fairly stable. I believe that most people anticipated that that would occur as we moved directly into the recovery. It did not, much to some people's surprise. That was because the labor force was growing more slowly.

We do have still about 1,300,000 discouraged workers who are out there who may well be coming into the labor force at some point, and we also have the continued growth of the labor force of adult women and of adult men, although there has been a long-term decline in the labor force rate of growth of men over 55 years of age.

Representative LUNGREN. Senator.

Senator PROXMIRE. Commissioner Norwood, one conspicuous contrast here is the fact that we have no improvement in unemployment for 3 months, but we have a 20-year record of overtime.

One policy action we could take—I am sure it would be resisted by most management and part of our labor—would be to change time and-a-half to double time. If the Congress should do that, obviously it would put a premium on hiring new people.

The difficulty now is that in some industries, I understand, you may have a $10 an hour take-home wage but the fringe benefits almost double that. The fringe benefits can make the cost of labor to the employer $20 an hour. So if he keeps his workers working extra overtime, they may make $15 an hour, but there's no increase in fringes. On the other hand, if he hires a new worker, it's $20.

So either we have to cut fringes, which we're not going to do in all likelihood, or we have to increase the cost of overtime.

You've only been in this—only I say—for 21 years in this business, but do you have any estimate or analysis of what effect double time would have not only on jobs but also on inflation?

Ms. NORWOOD. No, I do not.

Senator PROXMIRE. Obviously, it would tend to increase cost and tend to increase prices, but how significant that would be would be important.

Ms. NORWOOD. So do bonuses, of course, and you read a lot about bonuses in the newspapers.

Senator PROXMIRE. Let me just go back for a minute to the problem we have that both the Congressman and I have been discussing about how unemployment may have leveled off at a high rate.

In every previous recession we've had—almost every one—the recovery has leveled off at a higher and higher rate, as you know. In 1951, it was 2.9; in 1957 it was 3.6; in 1960, 4.7; then there was somewhat of a drop, in 1968 it was 3.3, but since then, in 1973 it was 4.5; in 1979 it was 5.5 and in 1981, the peak of the recovery, unemployment was 7.1.

Now it's at 7.7 and if that pattern persists, it could level off at about 7.3, 7.4, or 7.5, something of that kind.

Is this just a statistical quirk or are there definite reasons why unemployment had been at a higher level at the peak of each recovery in recent years?

Ms. NORWOOD. Well, one reason—not the only reason—but one reason clearly has been changes in the composition of the labor force. One of the things that we are seeing now is a reduction in the number of teenagers entering the labor force and if you take the 16- to 24-year-age group, that group is not increasing in the labor force. Those are groups, both of them, which provide a lot of upward pressure on the unemployment rate because young people have, really by definition, higher unemployment rates than older workers do.

So, one of the things that's working for the country at the moment is this reduction or holding steady of the 16- to 24-year-age group in terms of numbers in the labor force. That did not occur in the past.

Senator PROXMIRE. That's a positive element that should work in our favor? It should help get unemployment lower.

Ms. NORWOOD. Very specifically. Then we do have, also, an increasing trend which we have had for a long time of a decline in labor force participation rates particularly of older men. That, too, could work perhaps in our favor.

Senator PROXMIRE. Let me ask you about—Congressman Lungren has asked about this, too, and I'd like to ask a little further, about the black unemployment.

The overall jobless rate for blacks was 16.8 percent in April which, of course, is scandalously high, essentially unchanged since the beginning of the year.

Compared with whites, did more black workers lose their jobs permanently during the recession?

Ms. NORWOOD. I'm not sure. It is very clear that our black workers, particularly the black adult men, were hurt by the downturn that occurred sometime ago and then very much more by the recession that began in 1981. We have seen during the recovery an in-

crease in employment for black adult men and we have seen an increase in their employment-population ratios. But it is true that the increase for whites has been somewhat larger.

Senator PROXMIRE. How do the current unemployment rates for black men, women, and teenagers compare to those in mid-1981 before the recession began?

Ms. NORWOOD. The rate is considerably higher than it was in mid-1981. It was 12.9. This is for adult men.

Senator PROXMIRE. It was 12.9 and now it's 16.8?

Ms. NORWOOD. No, 16.8 percent is the unemployment rate for all blacks. The rate for black adult men in April was 16 percent.

Senator PROXMIRE. Now you've given us overall local figures for the jobs and population ratio at about 60 percent, 59 something. What proportion of blacks currently have jobs and how do those compare with the period prior to the recession?

Ms. NORWOOD. 51.5 percent.

Senator PROXMIRE. Fifty-one percent, about half of them have jobs?

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes. That's for all black workers.

Senator PROXMIRE. That's for the population of blacks 16 years old and older?

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes. And that compares, if you went back to 1979, which was as you know a very good year, to rates of 53.5 and 54 percent.

Senator PROXMIRE. Thank you. My time is up.

Representative LUNGREN. Ms. Norwood, seasonally adjusted figures are obviously those that we work with as actual indicators of cyclical developments in the labor market, but one of the things that's important in trying to explain to many folks is how many folks have jobs this April who were without them in March. I guess I would call that the nonadjusted or unadjusted figures. And can you tell me what happened to the level of civilian employment and civilian unemployment between March and April based on unadjusted data?

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes. We had 102.8 million employed in March not seasonally adjusted and we're at 103.6 million now in April. Unemployment went from 9 million to 8.5 million not seasonally adjusted. We always have a decline in unemployment in the month of April.

Representative LUNGREN. That's why we figure the seasonal adjustment, to see how we compared with previous years?

Ms. NORWOOD. Seasonal adjustment in primarily useful in comparing different months.

Representative LUNGREN. Last month you reported you were beginning to see employment gains in machinery manufacturing. Did that trend continue in April?

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes. We have had an increase of 21,000 in employment in machinery manufacturing. Machinery manufacturing is generally one of the durable manufacturing industries which is rather slow to turn around.

Representative LUNGREN. And that has been the case in this recovery as well?

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes.

Representative LUNGREN. In the past we have discussed some regional variations in the unemployment rate. Have these variations grown any more or less pronounced during 1984?

Ms. NORWOOD. We still have very great regional differences in this country, in large part, of course, because we have very large industrial differences from State to State. The Great Lakes region and some of the States in the Southeast still have very high unemployment rates. We also have some in the Pacific Northwest. They have had some improvement, but they're still above average rates.

Representative LUNGREN. I understand there was no change in the CPI for urban wage earners and clerical workers in March, according to your most recent release, and we touched on this just a few minutes ago, but I'd like to know what specifically happened in real hourly earnings in March.

Mr. PLEWES. Real average weekly earnings decreased three-tenths of 1-percent from February to March after seasonal adjustment. The two-tenths percent increase in the average hourly earnings was offset by a six-tenths of 1-percent decrease in average weekly hours. There was no change in prices.

Representative LUNGREN. And that was for which months?

Mr. PLEWES. That was between February and March.

Ms. NORWOOD. I would like to point out that the reason that the CPI for urban wage earners and clerical workers was unchanged before the seasonal adjustment was largely because of the homeownership component. You will recall that some years ago we changed the treatment of homeownership in the CPI for all urban consumers and we are scheduled next year to do that in the CPI-W. We have given 3 years of notice. The CPI-U went up two-tenths after seasonal adjustment and two-tenths before seasonal adjustment.

So there is that difference and that's almost entirely due to the change in homeownership.

Representative LUNGREN. Productivity we have been told many times is a measure of the volume of goods and services that the economy puts out in an hour of paid time. Also, I have been told by many that productivity is one of the things we have to look at as a precursor, if you will, of inflation.

What can you tell us happened to business productivity during the first quarter of 1984?

Ms. NORWOOD. It's up 2.6 percent.

Representative LUNGREN. And what effect, if any, would the large employment gains registered during the first quarter have on those estimates, if any?

Ms. NORWOOD. Well, it would depend, of course, on how much output went up and I think the fact that our manufacturing industry is expanding hours before hiring more workers is probably going to help productivity.

One of the interesting things is that we produce a table in the release of aggregate hours, an index of aggregate hours, which really in a sense combines employment and hours. And if you look at the aggregate hours index for manufacturing, that's in table B-5—you see that over the year in manufacturing, it's gone up 10 index points. That's because both hours and employment have increased.

Representative LUNGREN. How does that compare with previous recovery periods? Is there some index that gives us a clue as to how we compare this with previous recovery periods?

Ms. NORWOOD. The growth in hours has been much larger than in 1975–76 and I believe in most other recovery periods.

Representative LUNGREN. In some previous months you've told us that the unemployment rate in the auto industry has dropped dramatically. Although we have discussed how overall employment—that is total number of people working in the auto industry certainly is not what it was 5 years ago or whenever the top year was—1977 or 1975 or whatever—how is the auto production unemployment holding up in the latest figures that we have?

Ms. NORWOOD. The unemployment rate for automobile workers is 6.3 percent. That, of course, is considerably lower—it's about a third of what it was during the recession period. But we should understand that this is a figure which relates to the last job of the worker. So that the unemployed worker who was laid off from the auto industry and then took another job temporarily would no longer be classified, if he became unemployed again, as an unemployed autoworker.

Representative LUNGREN. If he had gotten a job somewhere else?

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes.

Representative LUNGREN. Senator.

Senator PROXMIRE. Commissioner Norwood, suppose Congress got religion in this big operation we have now in trying to cut the deficit and supposing we cut spending $100 billion a year at an annual rate and raised taxes by $100 billion. What effect would that be likely to have, in your expert judgment, on employment? Would that increase the unemployment? Would that be sufficient in the view of the size of our gross national product of well over $3 trillion to perhaps increase unemployment by a whole percent?

Ms. NORWOOD. I don't know what those relationships would be.

Senator PROXMIRE. Would it be possible for your agency to get into that? The reason I ask is because we have had estimates by DRI and others who say that if we make that kind of cut in the deficit over a period of a year or two—it might be less if we did it more gradually—that it would have quite a dramatic effect on increasing unemployment. And since you're the Government's expert on unemployment and on these statistics, I think it would be very helpful to us if you could make that kind of estimate.

Ms. NORWOOD. I think the agency really who is competent—certainly far more competent than we—to do that is the Congressional Budget Office.

Senator PROXMIRE. They are more partisan, though.

Ms. NORWOOD. They're quite a nonpartisan agency.

Senator PROXMIRE. Oh, the Congressional Budget Office?

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes, CBO.

Senator PROXMIRE. That's better. I was thinking of——

Ms. NORWOOD. It's the instrumentality of the Congress. It has to be bipartisan—nonpartisan.

Representative LUNGREN. We're never partisan.

Senator PROXMIRE. I was thinking of the administration's budget office.

Ms. NORWOOD. OMB? No; I was proposing that you ask that question of CBO.

Senator PROXMIRE. Well, on that point, I want to commend the chairman for being especially nonpartisan today. He came over and he posed by this graph here which the Democrats put up. What that graph shows is during the Carter administration, 1977 to 1980, unemployment averaged 6.5 percent. Look at it during the Reagan administration. The lowest was 7.3. It's now at 7.7 or 7.8, and it went up to 10.6. And I think to have a chairman that calls attention to that, a Republican chairman who does that, he's got an open mind, he's very fair, and it's a privilege to have a chance to share the podium with him this morning.

Commissioner Norwood, how many States have double digit unemployment rates? You spoke about regional differences, but I'd like to be a little more specific than that. Which States are those?

Mr. PLEWES. Again, Senator, for the month of February, the States that have 10 percent or more are Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, District of Columbia——

Senator PROXMIRE. The District of Columbia?

Mr. PLEWES. The District has 12 percent.

Senator PROXMIRE. That's a surprise to me.

Mr. PLEWES. Illinois, 10.1; Indiana, 11; Kentucky, 10.6; Michigan, 12.6; Mississippi, 10.8; Ohio, 10.1; Oregon, 10.9; Pennsylvania, 11.

Senator PROXMIRE. Oregon was one?

Mr. PLEWES. Yes, sir. State of Washington, 11.8; West Virginia, 16.5; Puerto Rico, 21 percent.

Senator PROXMIRE. Let me ask you, Commissioner, do a relatively small number of States account for much of the remaining unemployment or is joblessness still relatively widespread?

Ms. NORWOOD. There are vast differences among the States and, as you know, we had quite a list of States which have high unemployment rates. There are pockets of unemployment throughout the country, but it is clear that the Great Lakes area and some of the Southeast and the Pacific Northwest have the highest rates and probably have a higher proportion of unemployment.

Senator PROXMIRE. Which States have been recovering most rapidly from the unemployment?

Ms. NORWOOD. We can supply that for the record by examining all of the data.

Senator PROXMIRE. Very good.

Ms. NORWOOD. It would depend upon the industrial structure of the State.

[The following information was subsequently supplied for the record:]

The States with the most rapid improvement in their unemployment rate during the February 1983 to February 1984 period—that is, those with an unemployment rate decline of 3.5 percentage points or more—are Alabama, Arizona, Idaho, Illinois, Kentucky, Michigan, Mississippi, Nevada, North Carolina, Ohio, South Carolina, Tennessee, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming. The overall national civilian worker unemployment rate declined by 2.9 percentage points—from 11.3 to 8.4 percent, not seasonally adjusted—during this period.

Senator PROXMIRE. What proportion of the unemployed are now drawing unemployment insurance benefits?

Ms. NORWOOD. Total UI recipients, including those receiving extended benefits, is 35 percent of total unemployment, as measured in the Current Population Survey.

Senator PROXMIRE. Thirty-five percent, only one in three?

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes.

Senator PROXMIRE. That certainly is different that I felt was the situation and I think many people did. Is that proportion declining?

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes, it is.

Senator PROXMIRE. How many unemployed are not covered by unemployment insurance?

Ms. NORWOOD. How many are not covered?

Senator PROXMIRE. Not covered.

Ms. NORWOOD. Well, I don't know about the coverage, Senator Proxmire. We do know about the number of claimants and as we have more entrants and reentrants into the labor force, we know that there is a likelihood that a larger number of the unemployed——

Senator PROXMIRE. For the record, could you tell us that? And then also tell us how many have exhausted all benefits under the regular, extended, and supplemental unemployment programs?

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes, sir.

[The following information was subsequently supplied for the record:]

During February 1984, the most recent month for which data are available, about 258,000 persons exhausted regular benefits, 8,000 exhausted extended benefits, and 161,000 exhausted their Federal Supplemental Compensation benefits. (These data are not seasonally adjusted.)

Senator PROXMIRE. Following a decline in employment during March, jobs in the construction business rose by 74,000 in April. You report that weather may explain that development because March was a bad month and April was a better month. Since housing starts have recently fallen, are the construction employment gains overstated, and does this in part reflect the seasonal adjustment process because of recent recession years tend to assume a weaker economy and less construction activity than is usually the case?

Your seasonal figures, I take it, are constantly updated, so they are based on the most recent experience.

Mr. PLEWES. Senator, the figures you gave are correct. There was a weather-related decline in the previous month and there was an increase this month. The increase was consistent with the decline in housing starts, by the way. We saw the increase in the category called special trade which are your subcontractors primarily, and in such areas as highway and office construction. It was not in residential construction.

Senator PROXMIRE. I see. Commissioner Norwood, housing starts declined sharply by 27 percent in March. That was a spectacular figure and a lot of people felt, even though the weather in March was bad, that there may have been other reasons for that, and it alarmed many people. Meanwhile, interest rates already high in real terms have been rising. Is economic activity in housing and other interest-sensitive sectors starting to fall off?

Ms. NORWOOD. As you are well aware, those numbers do tend to jump around. We have had several months out of the recent 6 months where housing starts have been quite negative. So I think we need a little bit more time. We had very large increases in housing starts in January and in February. So that fact that we have had a sizable decline in March I think by itself does not tell us a great deal.

On the other hand, we do know that mortgage interest rates are rising or have risen something like a point.

Senator PROXMIRE. I just have one more question, and the chairman very graciously has allowed me to proceed.

Do you expect food prices and energy prices to be the source of inflationary pressures in the months ahead and has the long-term decline in energy prices ended?

Ms. NORWOOD. The Agriculture Department expects food prices to be a source of rising prices over the next year.

As for energy, a lot of the future, of course, will depend upon occurrences that are really outside of all of our control and therefore very difficult to forecast.

There seems at the moment to be plentiful supplies of energy. Perhaps Mr. Dalton might want to add to that.

Mr. DALTON. No, I don't have anything to add.

Senator PROXMIRE. Thank you very much, Congressman.

Representative LUNGREN. Madam Commissioner, we certainly enjoy having you appear before us again this month. I was going to ask Mr. Plewes to list all of the States with unemployment rates below 10 percent, but that would take too much time so I won't do that. The only figures I'd like to make sure that we get in the record are those for my home State of California.

From the information your office supplies me, I'm happy to see that on a seasonally adjusted basis, employment reached an all-time high in California of 11.5 million in March, with unemployment dropping to 954,000 in April, reaching the lowest level since September 1981. We've got a seasonally adjusted unemployment rate of 7.7 percent, the lowest since September 1981, and in my own area of Los Angeles County, the Long Beach area, the decline over the year was 2.4 percentage points.

So we are part of the recovery and we certainly enjoy it.

Next month, I may, in the spirit of bipartisanship, have a chart here that we on the Republican side will fix up to show what's happened to inflation and interest rates and I will invite Senator Proxmire to stand before that to acknowledge that we have had a tremendous drop in both of those.

Senator. PROXMIRE. If the Congressman would yield, I'd like to put those two together and show what the real interest rates are; that is, the interests rate minus inflation, and they are about as high as they've ever been.

Representative LUNGREN. And maybe we could also have a discussion some time about my theory that not all taxes are created equal. Just saying we could increase taxes by $100 billion doesn't suggest we will have a drop in unemployment. We could very well have an increase in unemployment, as the Senator suggested with the cost of automobiles and the cost of a lot of other things rising. We're doing a great job in the Congress in raising Social Security

taxes year after year, and it seems to me that might have some impact on the initial cost of employing new people and maybe we ought to take a look at that as well.

Well, as you can see, Madam Commissioner, we are not very partisan up here. We thank you for being here before us and look forward to seeing you again next month.

Ms. NORWOOD. Thank you very much.

Representative LUNGREN. The committee stands adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 10:35 a.m., the committee adjourned, subject to the call of the Chair.]

EMPLOYMENT-UNEMPLOYMENT

FRIDAY, JUNE 1, 1984

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES
JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE,
Washington, DC.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD-106, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. Daniel E. Lungren (member of the committee) presiding.

Present: Representative Lungren and Senator Proxmire.

Also present: Dan C. Roberts, executive director; James K. Galbraith, deputy director; Deborah Clay-Mendez and Mary E. Eccles, professional staff members.

OPENING STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE LUNGREN, PRESIDING

Representative LUNGREN. We welcome once again, Madam Commissioner, you and your colleagues for our monthly meeting on the question of the unemployment situation. According to your report, the civilian unemployment rate fell by three-tenths of 1 percentage point in May to a level of 7.5 percent. I think we would all agree that this is very good news indeed. In fact, it is so good, what I have predicted in the past has come true. We've had one month in which news was so good that we would have no television cameras here. The television cameras seem to appear when the news is bad, so this is another index that in fact the news is very good.

It reflects improvements in the health of the American economy and, most importantly, the welfare of the American people. During the past 18 months, under President Reagan's economic policies, the civilian unemployment rate has fallen a remarkable 3.2-percentage points. The very favorable report you bring us today is a confirmation that this downward trend continues.

We have sought to reduce the burden of Government regulation under President Reagan's leadership and to set free once again the spirit of free competition and the power of private enterprise. We have relied on the private sector to provide employment for Americans. Apparently, the private sector has responded. According to your report, the number of Americans holding jobs increased by an impressive 890,000 in May. This sets, once again, a new record level for civilian employment.

During the past 1½ years, employment—as measured by the Bureau of Labor Statistic's household survey—has risen by more than 6 million. This is the best record for any 18 months in the post World War II period. In the past, critics of the economy's performance have pointed to the somewhat lower employment gains

measured by the Bureau's establishment survey data. Today, the Bureau has released its annual revision of the establishment data. I am pleased to see that there has been a substantial upward revision in the employment estimates. This brings them more into line with the household survey data. With the report you bring today, I don't think there can be any doubt about the unprecedented record of the past 18 months of job creation.

Mr. Norwood, despite this growth in employment opportunities, we recognize that there are groups within our society who suffer a disproportionate share of unemployment. According to the May data, 44.1 percent of black youths are unemployed. Even though there is a problem with the total youth unemployment, black youth unemployment is more pronounced. This is by no means a new problem. Incredibly, at no time in the entire past decade has this unemployment rate for black teenage youth fallen below 30 percent. The administration, in an effort to open job opportunities to unskilled youths, has proposed the establishment of a youth employment opportunity wage for the summer months, something that I have supported for some time, and these figures would suggest that we perhaps need to try some new things to attack this problem.

In view of the severity of the youth unemployment problem and its persistence in the face of strong economic growth, many of the Republican members of the Joint Economic Committee support this type of innovative approach.

Madam Commissioner, we welcome you once again to the Joint Economic Committee. We look forward to your testimony about the very favorable developments in the May employment situation.

Before you proceed, however, I would ask Senator Proxmire if he has a statement.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR PROXMIRE

Senator PROXMIRE. Well, I have no formal statement, Congressman, but I have a couple of observations.

One, I'd like to congratulate you on your appearance on the Public Broadcasting System's program. I had a chance to see that and I was very, very impressed with it. You did a superlative job and you made me proud to be a Member of Congress. Of course, you're a Republican, but nobody is perfect.

Now there is good news. There's no question about that. You can't get away from the fact that when we have this kind of improvement in the employment and a drop in unemployment it's good. Although we did have, of course, no improvement in March or in April, and it's about time that we got some.

Also, I think it is fair to point out that we now have unemployment at just about precisely the same level it was when President Reagan took office in January 1981. That means that in spite of the fact that the administration has managed to run up the biggest deficits in the history of our country, deficits which ordinarily would greatly improve employment and improve the economy, we are left with a colossal increase in national debt, an economic picture that may be flattening out, and a perfectly enormous deficit that we have this year and had last year and can expect to have

for some time in the future. And the result is that, as the chart here shows, interest rates have gone up very sharply since January 1981. They have gone down a little bit in real terms lately, but they're still extraordinarily high and they constitute a real threat.

I'm looking forward to your presentation. Commissioner Norwood, and I am also looking forward to questioning you on it.

Representative LUNGREN. Thank you, Senator.

Ms. NORWOOD.

STATEMENT OF HON. JANET L. NORWOOD, COMMISSIONER, BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, ACCOMPANIED BY THOMAS J. PLEWES, ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER, OFFICE OF EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT STATISTICS; AND KENNETH V. DALTON, ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER, OFFICE OF PRICES AND LIVING CONDITIONS

Ms. NORWOOD. Thank you. Mr. Chairman and Senator Proxmire, I have with me Kenneth Dalton on my right who is responsible for our price work in the Bureau, and Thomas Plewes on my left who is responsible for our employment and unemployment data.

We are very pleased, as always, to have an opportunity to offer a few brief comments to the committee on our employment situation press release that was issued earlier this morning.

Both the household and the business surveys showed further employment gains in May, and the unemployment rate dropped to its lowest point since August 1981. The overall jobless rate, which includes the resident Armed Forces in the labor force, was 7.4 percent, down from 7.7 percent in the February-April period. The rate for civilian workers was 7.5 percent, also three-tenths of a percentage point lower than the prior 3 months. Both rates have declined by 3.2 percentage points from their late 1982 recession highs.

The number of unemployed workers dropped by 330,000 over the month to 8.5 million in May, after seasonal adjustment, as there was a substantial decline in the number of workers who had lost their jobs. The number of job losers—as distinct from those who were jobless because they left their jobs or were entering or reentering the labor force—has declined by 3 million over the 18 months of the recovery.

The bulk of the May unemployment decline occurred among adult men, whose jobless rate dropped from 6.9 to 6.5 percent; the rate for adult women was 6.8 in May compared to 7 percent in April. During the 1981–82 recession, the rate for men, which is usually lower than that for women, rose sharply and in a number of months was more than a full percentage point higher than the rate for women. Men's joblessness has shown greater improvement during the recovery, however, and the May figures mark the first time since early in the recession that their rate has been significantly below that for women.

The over-the-month improvement in unemployment among adult men occurred among both blacks and whites and was reflected in the overall reduction in joblessness among black and white workers. The jobless rate among Hispanic workers also declined over the month.

Civilian employment, as measured by the household survey, rose by an unusually large 890,000 in May after seasonal adjustment. This was considerably larger—about 660,000 more—than the increase in our business survey. A part of this difference is due to definitional differences in the coverage of the two surveys. A part of the difference is not so readily explainable but may be influenced by problems in identifying seasonal movements. Seasonal adjustment of employment—as well as unemployment—is especially difficult at this time of the year. Employment usually increases as outdoor activities expand and large numbers of young people enter the summer labor market. This year, identification of the seasonal patterns is even more difficult because the survey week was earlier than usual. The 12th of the month, which defines the survey week, fell on a Saturday. In my judgment, all signs point to a marked increase in employment between April and May, but the changes reported in the household survey may be somewhat overstated.

Nonagricultural payroll employment rose 230,000 in May. The business survey has shown consistent and substantial job growth over the year and a half of the current recovery. The over-the-month advance was led by increases of 90,000 in services and 60,000 in construction. In contrast to the pattern during recent months, overall factory jobs did not increase in May, although there were continued job gains in the machinery and electrical equipment industries, both of which have rebounded strongly in recent months of the recovery.

Over the past year and a half, The business survey has registered increases of 1.5 million factory jobs and nearly 500,000 in construction. The recovery in manufacturing represents about two-thirds of the number of jobs lost during the recession, while the expansion in construction activity has brought the job total above the pre-1981–82 recession level. Over the same period, jobs in services and in retail trade, which were very little affected by the recession, increased by 1.4 million and 950,000, respectively.

After an unusually large increase in April, the average workweek of production or nonsupervisory workers on private nonagricultural payrolls declined 0.2 hour in May, returning to the still very high levels reached in February and March. The average workweek in manufacturing, at 40.7 hours, also returned to its March level.

In summary, the statistics released this morning indicate further strong labor market recovery. Employment continued to rise and unemployment resumed the improvement that has seen the jobless rate decline by more than 3 percentage points over the course of the recovery.

Mr. Chairman, we would be very happy to try to answer any questions you may have.

[The table attached to Ms. Norwood's statement, together with the Employment Situation press release referred to, follows:]

UNEMPLOYMENT RATES OF ALL CIVILIAN WORKERS BY ALTERNATIVE SEASONAL ADJUSTMENT METHODS

Month and year	Unadjusted rate	X–11 ARIMA method					X–11 method (official method before 1980)	Range (cols. 2–7)
		Official procedure	Concurrent	Stable	Total	Residual		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
1983								
May	9.8	10.1	10.1	10.2	10.1	10.1	10.1	0.1
June	10.2	10.0	10.0	10.0	9.8	10.0	10.0	.2
July	9.4	9.5	9.5	9.4	9.5	9.5	9.5	.1
August	9.2	9.5	9.5	9.4	9.5	9.5	9.5	.1
September	8.8	9.2	9.2	9.2	9.2	9.1	9.3	.2
October	8.4	8.8	8.8	9.0	8.8	8.8	8.9	.2
November	8.1	8.4	8.4	8.5	8.4	8.4	8.4	.1
December	8.0	8.2	8.2	8.4	8.2	8.2	8.2	.2
1984								
January	8.8	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.1	8.0	8.0	.1
February	8.4	7.8	7.8	7.6	7.8	7.7	7.8	.2
March	8.1	7.8	7.8	7.7	7.8	7.6	7.7	.2
April	7.6	7.8	7.8	7.8	7.8	7.8	7.8	.....
May	7.2	7.5	7.5	7.6	7.4	7.6	7.5	.2

Explanation of Column Heads

(1) Unadjusted rate. Unemployment rate for all civilian workers, not seasonally adjusted.

(2) Official procedure (X–11 ARIMA method). The published seasonally adjusted rate for all civilian workers. Each of the 3 major civilian labor force components—agricultural employment, nonagricultural employment and unemployment—for 4 age-sex groups—males and females, ages 16–19 and 20 years and over—are seasonally adjusted independently using data from January 1974 forward. The data series for each of these 12 components are extended by a year at each end of the original series using ARIMA (Auto-Regressive, Integrated, Moving Average) models chosen specifically for each series. Each extended series is then seasonally adjusted with the X–11 portion of the X–11 ARIMA program. The 4 teenage unemployment and nonagricultural employment components are adjusted with the additive adjustment model, while the other components are adjusted with the multiplicative model. The unemployment rate is computed by summing the 4 seasonally adjusted unemployment components and calculating that total as a percent of the civilian labor force total derived by summing all 12 seasonally adjusted components. All the seasonally adjusted series are revised a the end of each year. Extrapolated factors for January-June are computed at the beginning of each year; extrapolated factors for July-December are computed in the middle of the year after the June data become available. Each set of 6-month factors are published in advance, in the January and July issues, respectively, of Employment and Earnings.

(3) Concurrent (X–11 ARIMA method). The official procedure for computation of the rate for all civilian workers using the 12 components is followed except that extrapolated factors are not used at all. Each component is seasonally adjusted with the X–11 ARIMA program each month as the most recent data become available. Rates for each month of the current year are shown as first computed; they are revised only once each year, at the end of the year when data for the full year become available. For example, the rate for January 1984 would be based, during 1984, on the adjustment of data from the period January 1974 through January 1984.

(4) Stable (X–11 ARIMA method). Each of the 12 civilian labor force components is extended using ARIMA models as in the official procedure and then run through the X–11 part of the program using the stable option. This option assumes that seasonal patterns are basically constant from year-to-year and computes final seasonal factors as unweighted averages of all the seasonal-irregular components for each month across the entire span of the period adjusted. As in the official procedures, factors are extrapolated in 6-month intervals and the series are revised at the end

of each year. The procedure for computation of the rate from the seasonally adjusted components is also identical to the official procedure.

(5) Total (X–11 ARIMA method). This is one alternative aggregation procedure, in which total unemployment and civilian labor force levels are extended with ARIMA models and directly adjusted with multiplicative adjustment models in the X–11 part of the program. The rate is computed by taking seasonally adjusted total unemployment as a percent of seasonally adjusted total civilian labor force. Factors are extrapolated in 6-month intervals and the series revised at the end of each year.

(6) Residual (X–11 ARIMA method). This is another alternative aggregation method, in which total civilian employment and civilian labor force levels are extended using ARIMA models and then directly adjusted with multiplicative adjustment models. The seasonally adjusted unemployment levels is derived by subtracting seasonally adjusted employment from seasonally adjusted labor force. The rate is then computed by taking the derived unemployment level as a percent of the labor force level. Factors are extrapolated in 6-month intervals and the series revised at the end of each year.

(7) X–11 method (official method before 1980). The method for computation of the official procedure is used except that the series are not extended with ARIMA models and the factors are projected in 12-month intervals. The standard X–11 program is used to perform the seasonal adjustment.

Methods of Adjustment. The X–11 ARIMA method was developed at Statistics Canada by the Seasonal Adjustment and Times Series Staff under the direction of Estela Bee Dagum. The method is described in "The X–11 ARIMA Seasonal Adjustment Method," by Estela Bee Dagum, Statistics Canada Catalogue No. 12–564E, February 1980.

The standard X–11 method is described in "X–11 Variant of the Census Method II Seasonal Adjustment Program," by Julius Shiskin, Allan Young, and John Musgrave (Technical Paper No. 15, Bureau of the Census, 1967).

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, June 1984.

News

U.S. Department of Labor
Bureau of Labor Statistics
Washington, D.C. 20212

Technical information: (202) 523-1371
523-1944
523-1959
Media contact: 523-1913

USDL 84-249
TRANSMISSION OF MATERIAL IN THIS RELEASE IS EMBARGOED UNTIL 8:30 A.M. (EDT), FRIDAY, JUNE 1, 1984

THE EMPLOYMENT SITUATION: MAY 1984

Unemployment declined in May and employment continued to rise, the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U.S. Department of Labor reported today. The overall unemployment rate, at 7.4 percent, and the civilian worker rate, at 7.5 percent, were each down three-tenths of a percentage point over the month.

Civilian employment--as measured by the monthly survey of households--rose by 890,000 in May to 105.3 million. The number of employees on nonagricultural payrolls--as measured by the monthly survey of establishments--rose by 230,000, following a larger increase in the previous month. (Establishment data reflect the annual benchmark revisions; see note on page 3.)

Unemployment (Household Survey Data)

The civilian unemployment rate declined to 7.5 percent in May, after holding at 7.8 percent during the February-April period. The rate has decreased by 3.2 percentage points from its late 1982 high and was at the lowest level since August 1981.

The May decline in joblessness was concentrated among adult men (20 years and over). Since January, their unemployment rate has fallen by eight-tenths of a point, while the rate for adult women dropped by only three-tenths. As a result, the adult male rate of 6.5 percent was significantly below the rate for adult women (6.8 percent) for the first time since late 1981. At 19.0 percent in May, the unemployment rate for teenagers has been little changed in 1984. Whites, blacks, and Hispanics all shared in the May decline in joblessness. Other major groups with lower unemployment rates were full-time workers (7.2 percent) and manufacturing workers (7.1 percent). (See tables A-2, A-3, and A-6.)

The number of unemployed persons decreased by 330,000 to 8.5 million in May. The decline occurred primarily among adult men, both white and black. Unemployment has dropped by 3.4 million since the recovery began. Virtually all of this decline took place among job losers--both those on layoff who expect to be recalled to work and those who have been permanently separated from their last job. As a result, this group's share of unemployment has dropped from 62 percent in November 1982 to 51 percent in May. (See table A-8.)

The decline in unemployment in May was concentrated among persons who had been jobless for less than 5 weeks. The effect of this decrease in short-term unemployment was to raise the median duration of unemployment to 8.7 weeks, while the mean was virtually unchanged at 18.4 weeks. (See table A-7.)

The number of workers employed part time for economic reasons declined in May to 5.4 million, 1 million below the November 1982 level. (See table A-4.)

Civilian Employment and the Labor Force (Household Survey Data)

Civilian employment showed strong growth from April to May, rising by 890,000 on a seasonally adjusted basis to 105.3 million. Adult women accounted for two-thirds of the gain and adult men the remainder, as teenagers showed no over-the-month employment change. The proportion of the civilian working age population with jobs reached 59.8 percent. The employment-population ratio for adult women was 50.5 percent, the first time ever that more than half of all adult women have been employed. (See table A-2.)

The civilian labor force rose by 560,000 in May. Over the year, labor force growth totaled 2.9 million--1.9 million adult women and close to 1.1 million adult men.

Industry Payroll Employment (Establishment Survey Data)

Nonfarm payroll employment increased by 230,000 in May, somewhat less than gains recorded in most months of the past year. At 93.7 million, seasonally adjusted, payroll employment has increased by 5.0 million since November 1982. Over this period, manufacturing posted the largest job gain (1.5 million), followed by services (1.4 million), retail trade (950,000), and construction (475,000). (See table B-1.)

The largest over-the-month increases took place in construction (60,000) and the services industry (90,000). Construction employment has been rising strongly throughout the recovery period to 4.3 million in May, its highest level since the spring of 1981. In services, a major part of the over-the-month increase took place in business services. Smaller job gains also occurred in wholesale trade of durable goods and in finance.

Table A. Major indicators of labor market activity, seasonally adjusted

Category	Quarterly averages			Monthly data			Apr.-May change
	1983		1984	1984			
	I	IV	I	Mar.	Apr.	May	
HOUSEHOLD DATA							
	Thousands of persons						
Labor force 1/	112,365	113,702	114,292	114,598	114,938	115,493	555
Total employment 1/	100,879	104,195	105,426	105,826	106,095	106,978	883
Civilian labor force	110,700	112,012	112,607	112,912	113,245	113,803	558
Civilian employment	99,214	102,506	103,740	104,140	104,402	105,288	886
Unemployment	11,486	9,507	8,866	8,772	8,843	8,514	-329
Not in labor force	62,805	62,938	63,072	62,912	62,724	62,320	-404
Discouraged workers	1,765	1,457	1,339	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
	Percent of labor force						
Unemployment rates:							
All workers 1/	10.2	8.4	7.8	7.7	7.7	7.4	-0.3
All civilian workers	10.4	8.5	7.9	7.8	7.8	7.5	-0.3
Adult men	9.7	7.8	7.0	6.8	6.9	6.5	-0.4
Adult women	8.9	7.2	7.0	6.9	7.0	6.8	-0.2
Teenagers	23.1	20.6	19.6	19.9	19.4	19.0	-0.4
White	9.1	7.4	6.8	6.7	6.7	6.4	-0.3
Black	20.2	17.9	16.5	16.6	16.8	15.8	-1.0
Hispanic origin	15.6	12.1	10.9	11.3	11.5	10.5	-1.0
ESTABLISHMENT DATA							
	Thousands of jobs						
Nonfarm payroll employment	88,833	91,686	92,765	93,058	93,456p	93,688p	232p
Goods-producing industries	22,873	24,050	24,518	24,595	24,763p	24,856p	93p
Service-producing industries	65,961	67,636	68,247	68,463	68,693p	68,832p	139p
	Hours of work						
Average weekly hours:							
Total private nonfarm	34.8	35.2	35.3	35.3	35.5p	35.3p	-0.2p
Manufacturing	39.4	40.6	40.8	40.7	41.2p	40.7p	-0.5p
Manufacturing overtime	2.5	3.3	3.5	3.5	3.7p	3.4p	-0.3p

1/ Includes the resident Armed Forces. N.A.=not available.
p=preliminary.
NOTE: The establishment data reflect revisions based on March 1983 benchmarks and updated seasonal adjustment factors.

In contrast with the substantial increases of recent months, manufacturing employment was about unchanged in May. However, job gains continued in fabricated metals, machinery, and electrical equipment. Motor vehicle and equipment employment, which had risen very strongly earlier in the recovery, decreased by 10,000 in May, reflecting some plant shutdowns for model changeover.

Weekly Hours (Establishment Survey Data)

The average workweek of production or nonsupervisory workers on private nonagricultural payrolls declined 0.2 hour in May to 35.3 hours, seasonally adjusted, a return to the levels of February and March. The manufacturing workweek fell by half an hour from the very high April level to 40.7 hours. The factory workweek has averaged 40.8 hours for the last 9 months--the highest sustained level since 1973. Overtime in manufacturing decreased 0.3 hour from an unusually high April level to 3.4 hours in May. (See table B-2.)

The index of aggregate weekly hours of production or nonsupervisory workers on private nonagricultural payrolls edged down 0.2 percent, seasonally adjusted, to 111.9 (1977=100) in May, reflecting the decline in hours. The manufacturing index decreased 0.9 percent over the month to 96.1 but was 15.5 percent above the November 1982 low. (See table B-5.)

Hourly and Weekly Earnings (Establishment Survey Data)

Average hourly earnings declined 0.4 percent in May, and average weekly earnings decreased 0.9 percent, seasonally adjusted. Before allowance for seasonality, hourly earnings edged down 1 cent to $8.28, and weekly earnings declined by 36 cents. Over the past year, average hourly earnings increased by 30 cents, while weekly earnings rose by $13.78. (See table B-3.)

The Hourly Earnings Index (Establishment Survey Data)

The Hourly Earnings Index (HEI) was 159.6 (1977=100) in May, seasonally adjusted, a decrease of 0.2 percent from April. For the 12 months ended in May, the increase (before seasonal adjustment) was 3.2 percent. The HEI excludes the effects of two types of changes unrelated to underlying wage rate movements--fluctuations in overtime in manufacturing and interindustry employment shifts. In dollars of constant purchasing power, the HEI increased 0.6 percent during the 12-month period ended in April. (See table B-4.)

Revisions in the Establishment Survey Data

In accordance with the usual practice, the establishment survey data published in this release have been revised to reflect complete counts of employment (benchmarks) derived from unemployment insurance tax records for the first quarter of 1983 plus preliminary counts from the same source for the second and third quarters of 1983. The revisions also incorporate an improved method for estimating the employment effect of the entry of new firms into the economy. In addition, new seasonal adjustment factors have been calculated, and all seasonally adjusted series have been revised to take account of the experience through March 1984.

Summary employment revisions are shown in the following two tables. Employment estimates, not seasonally adjusted, for February 1984 (the last published final estimates based on the previous benchmark) on the old and new benchmarks are presented in Table B. Table C contains revised seasonally adjusted over-the-month changes in total nonfarm payroll employment estimates for the November 1982-February 1984 period. Data on hours and earnings may have changed slightly as a result of the new employment weights.

The June 1984 issue of Employment and Earnings will contain a detailed discussion of the effects of the benchmark and new firm methodology revisions, seasonal adjustment factors for use in the ensuing 12-month period, and revised data for all regularly published tables containing national establishment survey data on employment, hours, and earnings.

Historical establishment series, not seasonally adjusted, have been revised from April 1982 forward, whereas seasonally adjusted series have been revised back to January 1979. All revised historical series will be published in a special supplement to Employment and Earnings, which is expected to become available in July. This supplement, when combined with the historical volume, Employment and Earnings, United States, 1909-78, Bulletin 1312-11, will comprise the full historical series on national data from the establishment survey.

Table B. Establishment survey employment estimates for February 1984, before and after revision, not seasonally adjusted

(In thousands)

Industry	February 1984 employment estimates		Difference
	Before revision	As revised	
Total nonfarm employment	91,140	91,612	472
Total private	75,121	75,477	356
Mining	1,039	964	-75
Construction	3,772	3,774	2
Manufacturing	19,312	19,181	-131
Transportation and public utilities	4,992	5,031	39
Wholesale trade	5,315	5,389	74
Retail trade	15,119	15,517	398
Finance, insurance, and real estate	5,525	5,546	21
Services	20,047	20,075	28
Government	16,019	16,135	116
Federal	2,746	2,746	-
State	3,748	3,770	22
Local	9,524	9,618	94

Table C. Seasonally adjusted over-the-month changes in total nonfarm employment before and after revision, November 1982 through February 1984

(In thousands)

Year and month	Change from previous month	
	Before revision	As revised
1982:		
November	-153	-146
December	-120	-28
1983:		
January	220	181
February	-139	-99
March	68	217
April	276	314
May	331	319
June	423	349
July	308	347
August	-404	-356
September	1,103	1,100
October	233	327
November	271	343
December	244	338
1984:		
January	331	365
February	427	455

Explanatory Note

This news release presents statistics from two major surveys, the Current Population Survey (household survey) and the Current Employment Statistics Survey (establishment survey). The household survey provides the information on the labor force, total employment, and unemployment that appears in the A tables, marked HOUSEHOLD DATA. It is a sample survey of about 60,000 households that is conducted by the Bureau of the Census with most of the findings analyzed and published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS).

The establishment survey provides the information on the employment, hours, and earnings of workers on nonagricultural payrolls that appears in the B tables, marked ESTABLISHMENT DATA. This information is collected from payroll records by BLS in cooperation with State agencies. The sample includes approximately 195,000 establishments employing over 35 million people.

For both surveys, the data for a given month are actually collected for and relate to a particular week. In the household survey, unless otherwise indicated, it is the calendar week that contains the 12th day of the month, which is called the survey week. In the establishment survey, the reference week is the pay period including the 12th, which may or may not correspond directly to the calendar week.

The data in this release are affected by a number of technical factors, including definitions, survey differences, seasonal adjustments, and the inevitable variance in results between a survey of a sample and a census of the entire population. Each of these factors is explained below.

Coverage, definitions and differences between surveys

The sample households in the household survey are selected so as to reflect the entire civilian noninstitutional population 16 years of age and older. Each person in a household is classified as employed, unemployed, or not in the labor force. Those who hold more than one job are classified according to the job at which they worked the most hours.

People are classified as *employed* if they did any work at all as paid civilians; worked in their own business or profession or on their own farm; or worked 15 hours or more in an enterprise operated by a member of their family, whether they were paid or not. People are also counted as employed if they were on unpaid leave because of illness, bad weather, disputes between labor and management, or personal reasons. Members of the Armed Forces stationed in the United States are also included in the employed total.

People are classified as *unemployed*, regardless of their eligibility for unemployment benefits or public assistance, if they meet all of the following criteria: They had no employment during the survey week; they were available for work at that time; and they made specific efforts to find employment sometime during the prior 4 weeks. Also included among the unemployed are persons not looking for work because they were laid off and waiting to be recalled and those expecting to report to a job within 30 days.

The *labor force* equals the sum of the number employed and the number unemployed. The *unemployment rate* is the percentage of unemployed people in the labor force (civilian plus the resident Armed Forces). Table A-5 presents a special grouping of seven measures of unemployment based on varying definitions of unemployment and the labor force. The definitions are provided in the table. The most restrictive definition yields U-1, and the most comprehensive yields U-7. The overall unemployment rate is U-5a, while U-5b represents the same measure with a civilian labor force base.

Unlike the household survey, the establishment survey only counts wage and salary employees whose names appear on the payroll records of nonagricultural firms. As a result, there are many differences between the two surveys, among which are the following:

-----The household survey, although based on a smaller sample, reflects a larger segment of the population; the establishment survey excludes agriculture, the self-employed, unpaid family workers, private household workers, and members of the resident Armed Forces;

-----The household survey includes people on unpaid leave among the employed; the establishment survey does not;

-----The household survey is limited to those 16 years of age and older; the establishment survey is not limited by age;

-----The household survey has no duplication of individuals, because each individual is counted only once; in the establishment survey, employees working at more than one job or otherwise appearing on more than one payroll would be counted separately for each appearance.

Other differences between the two surveys are described in "Comparing Employment Estimates from Household and Payroll Surveys," which may be obtained from the BLS upon request.

Seasonal adjustment

Over a course of a year, the size of the Nation's labor force and the levels of employment and unemployment undergo sharp fluctuations due to such seasonal events as changes in weather, reduced or expanded production, harvests, major holidays, and the opening and closing of schools. For example, the labor force increases by a large number each June, when schools close and many young people enter the job market. The effect of such seasonal variation can be very large; over the course of a year, for example, seasonality may account for as much as 95 percent of the month-to-month changes in unemployment.

Because these seasonal events follow a more or less regular pattern each year, their influence on statistical trends can be eliminated by adjusting the statistics from month to month. These adjustments make nonseasonal developments, such as declines in economic activity or increases in the participation of women in the labor force, easier to spot. To return to the school's-out example, the large number of people entering the labor force each June is likely to obscure any other changes that have taken place since May, making it difficult to determine if the level of economic activity has risen or declined. However, because the effect of students finishing school in previous years is known, the statistics for the current year can be adjusted to allow for a comparable change. Insofar as the seasonal adjustment is made correctly, the adjusted figure provides a more useful tool with which to analyze changes in economic activity.

Measures of labor force, employment, and unemployment contain components such as age and sex. Statistics for all

employees, production workers, average weekly hours, and average hourly earnings include components based on the employer's industry. All these statistics can be seasonally adjusted either by adjusting the total or by adjusting each of the components and combining them. The second procedure usually yields more accurate information and is therefore followed by BLS. For example, the seasonally adjusted figure for the labor force is the sum of eight seasonally adjusted civilian employment components, plus the resident Armed Forces total (not adjusted for seasonality), and four seasonally adjusted unemployment components; the total for unemployment is the sum of the four unemployment components; and the overall unemployment rate is derived by dividing the resulting estimate of total unemployment by the estimate of the labor force.

The numerical factors used to make the seasonal adjustments are recalculated regularly. For the household survey, the factors are calculated for the January-June period and again for the July-December period. The January revision is applied to data that have been published over the previous 5 years. For the establishment survey, updated factors for seasonal adjustment are calculated only once a year, along with the introduction of new benchmarks which are discussed at the end of the next section.

Sampling variability

Statistics based on the household and establishment surveys are subject to sampling error, that is, the estimate of the number of people employed and the other estimates drawn from these surveys probably differ from the figures that would be obtained from a complete census, even if the same questionnaires and procedures were used. In the household survey, the amount of the differences can be expressed in terms of standard errors. The numerical value of a standard error depends upon the size of the sample, the results of the survey, and other factors. However, the numerical value is always such that the chances are 68 out of 100 that an estimate based on the sample will differ by no more than the standard error from the results of a complete census. The chances are 90 out of 100 that an estimate based on the sample will differ by no more than 1.6 times the standard error from the results of a complete census. At the 90-percent level of confidence--the confidence limits used by BLS in its analyses--the error for the monthly change in total employment is on the order of plus or minus 328,000; for total unemployment it is 220,000; and, for the overall unemployment rate, it is 0.19 percentage point. These figures do not mean that the sample results are off by these magnitudes but, rather, that the chances are 90 out of 100 that the "true" level or rate would not be expected to differ from the estimates by more than these amounts.

Sampling errors for monthly surveys are reduced when the data are cumulated for several months, such as quarterly or annually. Also, as a general rule, the smaller the estimate, the larger the sampling error. Therefore, relatively speaking, the estimate of the size of the labor force is subject to less error than is the estimate of the number unemployed. And, among the unemployed, the sampling error for the jobless rate of adult men, for example, is much smaller than is the error for the jobless rate of teenagers. Specifically, the error on monthly change in the jobless rate for men is .26 percentage point; for teenagers, it is 1.25 percentage points.

In the establishment survey, estimates for the 2 most current months are based on incomplete returns; for this reason, these estimates are labeled preliminary in the tables. When all the returns in the sample have been received, the estimates are revised. In other words, data for the month of September are published in preliminary form in October and November and in final form in December. To remove errors that build up over time, a comprehensive count of the employed is conducted each year. The results of this survey are used to establish new benchmarks—comprehensive counts of employment—against which month-to-month changes can be measured. The new benchmarks also incorporate changes in the classification of industries and allow for the formation of new establishments.

Additional statistics and other information

In order to provide a broad view of the Nation's employment situation, BLS regularly publishes a wide variety of data in this news release. More comprehensive statistics are contained in *Employment and Earnings*, published each month by BLS. It is available for $6.00 per issue or $39.00 per year from the U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20204. A check or money order made out to the Superintendent of Documents must accompany all orders.

Employment and Earnings also provides approximations of the standard errors for the household survey data published in this release. For unemployment and other labor force categories, the standard errors appear in tables B through J of its "Explanatory Notes." Measures of the reliability of the data drawn from the establishment survey and the actual amounts of revision due to benchmark adjustments are provided in tables M, O, P, and Q of that publication.

HOUSEHOLD DATA

Table A-1. Employment status of the population, including Armed Forces in the United States, by sex

(Numbers in thousands)

Employment status and sex	Not seasonally adjusted			Seasonally adjusted[1]					
	May 1983	Apr. 1984	May 1984	Mar. 1983	Jan. 1984	Feb. 1984	Mar. 1984	Apr. 1984	May 1984
TOTAL									
Noninstitutional population[2]	175,622	177,662	177,813	175,622	177,219	177,363	177,510	177,662	177,811
Labor force[3]	111,377	113,845	114,981	112,619	113,903	114,377	114,548	114,938	115,093
Participation rate[4]	63.4	64.1	64.6	64.1	64.3	64.5	64.6	64.7	64.7
Total employed[5]	101,232	105,321	106,786	101,431	104,876	105,576	105,826	106,095	106,978
Employment-population ratio[6]	57.6	59.3	60.1	57.8	59.2	59.5	59.6	59.7	60.2
Resident Armed Forces	1,569	1,693	1,690	1,669	1,686	1,674	1,686	1,693	1,690
Civilian employed	99,663	103,628	105,096	99,762	103,190	103,892	104,140	104,402	105,289
Agriculture	3,511	3,191	3,529	3,374	3,271	3,395	3,281	3,193	3,389
Nonagricultural industries	96,032	100,437	101,567	96,388	99,918	100,496	100,859	101,009	101,899
Unemployed	10,765	8,525	8,194	11,189	9,026	8,801	8,722	8,843	8,115
Unemployment rate[7]	9.6	7.5	7.1	9.9	7.9	7.7	7.7	7.7	7.6
Not in labor force	63,544	63,817	62,833	63,003	63,316	62,986	62,962	62,726	62,720
Men, 16 years and over									
Noninstitutional population[2]	83,331	84,053	84,024	83,931	84,785	84,811	84,880	84,953	84,924
Labor force[3]	64,365	66,575	66,079	64,348	66,930	66,093	65,156	66,212	65,307
Participation rate[4]	75.3	76.0	76.4	76.7	76.6	76.8	76.8	76.8	76.8
Total employed[5]	57,703	59,665	60,606	57,744	59,781	60,147	60,290	60,293	60,629
Employment-population ratio[6]	68.8	70.2	71.3	68.8	70.5	70.9	71.0	71.0	71.3
Resident Armed Forces	1,528	1,588	1,545	1,528	1,582	1,540	1,542	1,548	1,545
Civilian employed	56,175	58,117	59,061	56,216	58,239	58,607	58,748	58,745	59,084
Unemployed	6,662	6,909	6,472	6,604	7,149	6,946	6,867	6,919	6,678
Unemployment rate[7]	8.9	7.8	8.9	10.3	7.9	7.4	7.4	7.4	7.3
Women, 16 years and over									
Noninstitutional population[2]	91,591	92,709	92,789	91,691	92,434	92,552	92,630	92,709	92,789
Labor force[3]	47,012	49,271	49,862	48,271	48,971	49,283	49,442	49,725	50,186
Participation rate[4]	52.3	53.1	53.7	52.6	53.0	53.2	53.4	53.6	54.1
Total employed[5]	43,529	45,655	46,180	43,687	45,094	45,429	45,536	45,802	46,350
Employment-population ratio[6]	47.5	49.2	49.8	47.6	48.8	49.1	49.2	49.4	50.0
Resident Armed Forces	141	105	145	141	104	144	144	145	145
Civilian employed	43,388	45,510	46,035	43,546	44,990	45,285	45,392	45,657	46,205
Unemployed	4,483	3,615	3,682	4,584	3,876	3,855	3,905	3,923	3,836
Unemployment rate[7]	9.2	7.3	7.4	9.5	7.9	7.8	7.9	7.9	7.6

[1] The population and Armed Forces figures are not adjusted for seasonal variation; therefore, identical numbers appear in the unadjusted and seasonally adjusted columns.

[2] Includes members of the Armed Forces stationed in the United States.

[3] Labor force as a percent of the noninstitutional population.

[4] Total employment as a percent of the noninstitutional population.

[5] Unemployment as a percent of the labor force (including the resident Armed Forces).

HOUSEHOLD DATA

Table A-2. Employment[1] status of the civilian population by sex and age

(Numbers in thousands)

Employment status, sex, and age	Not seasonally adjusted			Seasonally adjusted[1]					
	May 1987	Apr. 1988	May 1988	May 1987	Jan. 1988	Feb. 1988	Mar. 1988	Apr. 1988	May 1988
TOTAL									
Civilian noninstitutional population	176,053	175,963	176,123	175,963	175,533	175,675	175,824	175,969	176,123
Civilian labor force	113,336	117,152	117,251	116,950	117,215	117,493	117,932	117,795	117,803
Participation rate	64.4	66.7	66.6	66.5	66.8	66.9	67.1	67.0	66.9
Employed	98,543	103,428	103,094	98,762	103,190	103,092	103,740	103,807	103,299
Employment-population ratio[2]	56.2	58.9	58.7	56.3	58.8	58.7	59.2	59.1	58.8
Unemployed	14,765	13,725	14,158	14,189	14,026	14,401	14,272	13,988	14,504
Unemployment rate	13.0	11.7	12.1	12.1	12.0	12.3	12.1	11.9	12.3
Men, 20 years and over									
Civilian noninstitutional population	76,712	76,973	76,977	76,712	76,692	76,786	76,880	76,973	76,977
Civilian labor force	58,458	59,201	59,212	58,546	59,239	59,336	59,389	59,480	59,584
Participation rate	76.2	77.0	76.2	76.4	76.3	76.4	76.3	76.3	76.3
Employed	53,221	54,022	54,740	52,963	54,599	55,266	54,368	55,388	54,685
Employment-population ratio[2]	71.4	72.8	73.3	70.9	72.7	72.9	73.0	72.3	71.7
Agriculture	2,214	2,395	2,527	2,480	2,356	2,409	2,364	2,851	2,851
Nonagricultural industries	51,006	51,647	52,214	50,523	52,243	52,857	52,004	52,537	51,834
Unemployed	5,237	5,181	4,472	5,583	4,640	4,128	5,020	4,092	3,899
Unemployment rate	8.3	7.1	6.3	9.5	7.8	7.0	8.5	6.9	6.5
Women, 20 years and over									
Civilian noninstitutional population	93,345	95,168	95,272	93,899	94,840	94,942	95,064	95,168	95,272
Civilian labor force	48,181	49,562	49,867	48,339	48,983	49,258	49,459	49,703	49,222
Participation rate	52.6	53.6	53.0	52.8	53.0	53.2	53.4	53.7	53.2
Employed	43,378	45,594	45,097	43,583	45,798	45,778	45,715	45,917	45,054
Employment-population ratio[2]	46.4	49.3	48.4	46.4	48.3	48.2	48.1	48.3	47.5
Agriculture	567	573	612	605	624	640	574	619	610
Nonagricultural industries	42,811	45,021	44,485	42,978	45,174	45,138	45,141	45,298	44,444
Unemployed	4,803	3,969	4,770	4,756	3,185	3,480	3,744	3,786	4,168
Unemployment rate	9.9	8.0	9.6	9.8	6.5	7.1	7.6	7.6	8.5
Both sexes, 16 to 19 years									
Civilian noninstitutional population	15,342	15,822	15,874	15,342	15,001	15,031	15,080	15,828	15,874
Civilian labor force	7,693	7,787	7,650	8,073	7,935	8,081	8,065	8,012	8,034
Participation rate	50.1	49.2	48.2	52.6	52.9	53.9	53.5	50.6	50.6
Employed	6,305	6,812	6,238	6,716	6,592	6,988	6,657	6,900	6,500
Employment-population ratio[2]	39.9	40.5	39.2	40.5	42.7	43.5	43.4	43.6	40.0
Agriculture	351	265	370	329	240	346	343	321	327
Nonagricultural industries	5,954	6,548	5,868	6,387	6,352	6,642	6,314	6,579	6,173
Unemployed	1,388	1,375	1,412	1,357	1,343	1,093	1,408	1,112	1,534
Unemployment rate	18.0	17.7	18.5	16.8	16.9	13.5	17.5	13.9	19.0

[1] The population figures are not adjusted for seasonal variation; therefore, identical numbers appear in the unadjusted and seasonally adjusted columns.

[2] Civilian employment as a percent of the civilian noninstitutional population.

HOUSEHOLD DATA

Table A-3. Employment status of the civilian population by race, sex, age, and Hispanic origin

(Numbers in thousands)

Employment status, race, sex, age, and Hispanic origin	Not seasonally adjusted			Seasonally adjusted					
	May 1994	Apr. 1994	May 1993	May 1994	Feb. 1994	Dec. 1993	Mar. 1994	Nov. 1993	[illegible]
WHITE									
Civilian noninstitutional population	188,271	187,774	187,229	187,671	187,434	187,073	187,265	186,[illegible]	[illegible]
Civilian labor force	129,210	128,630	126,404	128,472	127,811	126,187	128,024	126,[illegible]	[illegible]
Participation rate	68.7	68.2	67.5	68.5	68.2	67.4	68.3	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employed	121,916	121,283	118,267	120,304	119,648	118,488	119,845	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employment-population ratio[2]	64.8	64.6	63.2	64.1	63.8	63.3	64.0	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployed	7,295	7,347	8,137	8,169	8,163	7,699	8,179	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployment rate	5.6	5.7	6.4	6.4	6.4	6.1	6.4	[illegible]	[illegible]
Men, 20 years and over									
Civilian labor force	61,581	61,353	62,119	61,561	61,370	61,335	62,194	[illegible]	[illegible]
Participation rate	78.6	78.4	78.6	78.7	78.6	78.6	79.4	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employed	57,291	58,994	56,889	57,231	56,964	56,769	57,343	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employment-population ratio[2]	73.2	73.7	72.4	73.1	73.0	72.7	73.5	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployed	4,290	4,359	5,230	4,330	4,306	4,566	4,851	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployment rate	6.2	6.1	6.8	6.6	6.6	6.7	6.8	[illegible]	[illegible]
Women, 20 years and over									
Civilian labor force	67,271	67,938	67,306	67,805	67,635	67,726	67,871	[illegible]	[illegible]
Participation rate	54.0	54.0	53.5	54.2	54.0	54.0	54.1	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employed	63,266	62,761	61,113	63,082	62,780	62,466	62,573	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employment-population ratio[2]	50.8	50.8	50.5	50.4	50.3	49.8	49.9	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployed	2,005	2,177	2,193	2,723	2,855	2,261	2,303	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployment rate	4.0	5.0	5.6	7.2	6.9	5.8	5.3	[illegible]	[illegible]
Both sexes, 16 to 19 years									
Civilian labor force	5,936	6,539	6,359	7,106	7,018	7,106	7,353	[illegible]	[illegible]
Participation rate	53.6	59.5	56.6	64.0	63.6	63.7	66.3	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employed	5,057	5,899	5,666	5,691	5,490	5,435	5,932	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employment-population ratio[2]	45.6	53.6	50.4	51.2	49.7	48.7	53.5	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployed	879	640	693	1,415	1,528	1,671	1,421	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployment rate	14.8	9.8	10.9	19.9	21.8	23.5	19.3	[illegible]	[illegible]
Men	13.3	10.4	10.4	20.4	21.8	23.4	19.6	[illegible]	[illegible]
Women	16.5	9.0	11.6	19.4	21.8	23.7	19.0	[illegible]	[illegible]
BLACK									
Civilian noninstitutional population	19,330	19,278	19,302	19,360	19,336	19,322	19,344	[illegible]	[illegible]
Civilian labor force	11,526	11,498	11,896	11,685	11,660	11,881	11,867	[illegible]	[illegible]
Participation rate	61.0	60.7	61.6	61.7	61.4	61.7	61.9	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employed	9,238	9,278	10,060	9,277	9,237	9,458	9,336	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employment-population ratio[2]	48.9	48.7	52.1	48.1	48.0	48.9	48.4	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployed	2,292	1,919	1,836	2,164	1,953	1,923	1,931	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployment rate	19.9	16.4	15.4	20.1	16.7	16.2	16.6	[illegible]	[illegible]
Men, 20 years and over									
Civilian labor force	5,496	5,487	5,666	5,606	5,631	5,677	5,663	[illegible]	[illegible]
Participation rate	74.5	73.9	74.8	75.1	74.8	75.3	75.2	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employed	4,638	4,688	4,872	4,835	4,789	4,877	4,749	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employment-population ratio[2]	63.5	62.0	64.3	63.6	63.7	64.4	63.5	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployed	1,260	899	795	1,071	843	800	913	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployment rate	17.3	14.1	14.0	19.1	18.8	19.1	16.4	[illegible]	[illegible]
Women, 20 years and over									
Civilian labor force	5,231	5,306	5,504	5,339	5,277	5,408	5,425	[illegible]	[illegible]
Participation rate	55.7	56.5	57.6	57.2	56.6	58.0	57.3	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employed	4,446	4,685	4,769	4,428	4,522	4,630	4,650	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employment-population ratio[2]	47.3	49.1	49.9	47.5	47.7	48.7	48.2	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployed	881	711	774	906	755	777	735	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployment rate	16.7	13.2	13.3	17.0	14.3	14.4	13.5	[illegible]	[illegible]
Both sexes, 16 to 19 years									
Civilian labor force	760	716	776	810	752	794	783	[illegible]	[illegible]
Participation rate	33.5	32.9	33.5	36.1	34.7	36.4	35.4	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employed	328	409	419	419	397	450	417	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employment-population ratio[2]	18.5	18.8	19.7	18.7	18.1	20.6	19.1	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployed	351	307	357	392	355	346	366	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployment rate	46.2	42.9	42.3	48.4	47.2	43.5	46.7	[illegible]	[illegible]
Men	51.2	41.2	39.6	52.1	47.1	46.7	48.4	[illegible]	[illegible]
Women	41.7	44.6	45.8	44.1	46.8	39.9	44.6	[illegible]	[illegible]
HISPANIC ORIGIN									
Civilian noninstitutional population	9,747	10,072	10,326	9,787	9,778	9,906	10,080	[illegible]	[illegible]
Civilian labor force	6,156	6,352	6,363	6,139	6,136	6,292	6,488	[illegible]	[illegible]
Participation rate	63.2	63.1	61.5	63.0	62.9	63.5	64.3	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employed	5,329	5,649	5,717	5,288	5,227	5,452	5,751	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employment-population ratio[2]	54.7	56.1	57.0	54.2	53.6	57.1	56.9	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployed	828	703	647	851	909	839	737	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployment rate	13.5	11.1	10.2	13.9	14.8	13.3	11.3	[illegible]	[illegible]

[1] The population figures are not adjusted for seasonal variation; therefore, identical numbers appear in the unadjusted and seasonally adjusted columns.

[2] Civilian employment as a percent of the civilian noninstitutional population.

NOTE: Detail for the above race and Hispanic-origin groups will not sum to totals because data for the "other races" group are not presented and Hispanics are included in both the white and black population groups.

HOUSEHOLD DATA

Table A-4. Selected employment indicators

(Numbers in thousands)

Category	Not seasonally adjusted			Seasonally adjusted					
	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	Jan. 1994	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
CHARACTERISTIC									
Civilian employed, 16 years and over	[illegible]	107,129	105,036	99,702	103,100	103,292	104,143	104,[illegible]	[illegible]
Married men, spouse present	[illegible]	38,749	38,[illegible]	37,616	38,682	38,911	38,727	38,062	37,[illegible]
Married women, spouse present	[illegible]	26,[illegible]	26,765	24,306	26,587	26,312	26,232	25,[illegible]	26,[illegible]
Women who maintain families	[illegible]	6,886	6,[illegible]	6,051	6,243	6,346	6,444	6,451	6,[illegible]
MAJOR INDUSTRY AND CLASS OF WORKER									
Agriculture:									
Wage and salary workers	1,[illegible]	1,[illegible]	1,[illegible]	1,[illegible]	1,[illegible]	1,[illegible]	1,515	1,[illegible]	1,[illegible]
Self-employed workers	1,[illegible]	1,[illegible]	1,[illegible]	1,[illegible]	1,[illegible]	1,[illegible]	1,[illegible]	1,[illegible]	1,[illegible]
Unpaid family workers	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Nonagricultural industries:									
Wage and salary workers	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Government	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Private industries	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Private households	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Other industries	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Self-employed workers	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unpaid family workers	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
PERSONS AT WORK									
Nonagricultural industries	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Full-time schedules	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Part time for economic reasons	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Usually work full time	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Usually work part time	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Part time for noneconomic reasons	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

[illegible] Excludes persons "with a job but not at work" during the survey period for such reasons as vacation, illness, or industrial dispute.

Table A-5. Range of unemployment measures based on varying definitions of unemployment and the labor force, seasonally adjusted

(Percent)

Measure	Quarterly averages					Monthly data		
	1993				1994	1994		
	I	II	III	IV	I	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
U-1 Persons unemployed 15 weeks or longer as a percent of the civilian labor force	4.2	4.0	3.7	3.1	2.7	2.5	[illegible]	[illegible]
U-2 Job losers as a percent of the civilian labor force	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	4.2	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
U-3 Unemployed persons 25 years and over as a percent of the civilian labor force	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
U-4 Unemployed full-time jobseekers as a percent of the full-time civilian labor force	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
U-5a Total unemployed as a percent of the labor force, including the resident Armed Forces	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
U-5b Total unemployed as a percent of the civilian labor force	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
U-6 Total full-time jobseekers plus ½ part-time jobseekers plus ½ total on part time for economic reasons as a percent of the civilian labor force less ½ of the part-time labor force	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
U-7 Total full-time jobseekers plus ½ part-time jobseekers plus ½ total on part time for economic reasons plus discouraged workers as a percent of the civilian labor force plus discouraged workers less ½ of the part-time labor force	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

N.A. = not available.

HOUSEHOLD DATA

HOUSEHOLD DATA

Table A-6. Selected unemployment indicators, seasonally adjusted

Category	Number of unemployed persons (in thousands)			Unemployment rates[1]					
	May 1983	Apr. 1984	May 1984	May 1983	Jan. 1984	Feb. 1984	Mar. 1984	Apr. 1984	May 1984
CHARACTERISTIC									
Total, 16 years and over	11,138	8,843	8,514	10.1	8.0	7.8	7.9	7.8	7.5
Men, 16 years and over	5,639	4,919	4,678	10.5	8.1	7.8	7.7	7.7	7.3
Men, 20 years and over	3,583	3,095	2,861	9.5	7.3	7.0	6.8	6.9	6.5
Women, 16 years and over	4,534	3,928	3,836	9.5	7.9	7.8	7.9	7.9	7.7
Women, 20 years and over	3,768	3,186	3,124	8.5	7.1	6.9	6.9	7.0	6.8
Both sexes, 16 to 19 years	1,837	1,562	1,529	23.0	19.4	19.3	19.9	19.4	19.0
Married men, spouse present	2,819	1,923	1,959	7.0	5.0	4.9	4.7	4.7	4.5
Married women, spouse present	1,952	1,564	1,574	7.4	6.0	5.9	5.8	5.8	5.8
Women who maintain families	725	645	616	12.7	10.7	11.0	11.3	10.5	9.8
Full-time workers	9,514	7,398	7,858	10.0	7.8	7.5	7.5	7.6	7.2
Part-time workers	1,637	1,443	1,895	10.9	9.2	9.3	9.2	9.1	9.3
Labor force time lost[2]	--	--	--	11.5	9.2	8.9	8.8	8.9	8.5
INDUSTRY									
Nonagricultural private wage and salary workers	9,528	6,482	6,055	10.8	7.9	7.8	7.6	7.7	7.2
Mining	232	100	89	20.8	10.9	12.7	11.2	10.3	8.9
Construction	1,062	795	830	20.0	15.0	15.1	13.3	14.3	14.8
Manufacturing	2,675	1,697	1,548	12.3	8.6	7.5	7.5	7.7	7.1
Durable goods	1,743	977	920	13.5	8.0	7.3	7.3	7.4	7.0
Nondurable goods	932	719	628	10.6	8.9	7.8	7.2	8.0	7.1
Transportation and public utilities	413	320	332	7.3	5.1	5.9	5.0	5.8	5.5
Wholesale and retail trade	2,110	1,857	1,690	10.2	8.4	8.3	8.3	8.7	7.9
Finance and service industries	1,994	1,674	1,567	7.5	6.3	6.3	6.4	6.1	5.5
Government workers	923	721	701	5.6	5.0	4.5	4.8	4.8	4.7
Agricultural wage and salary workers	321	231	261	16.8	15.5	18.0	16.6	12.2	13.9

[1] Unemployment as a percent of the civilian labor force.

[2] Aggregate hours lost by the unemployed and persons on part time for economic reasons as a percent of potentially available labor force hours.

Table A-7. Duration of unemployment

(Numbers in thousands)

Weeks of unemployment	Not seasonally adjusted			Seasonally adjusted					
	May 1983	Apr. 1984	May 1984	May 1983	Jan. 1984	Feb. 1984	Mar. 1984	Apr. 1984	May 1984
DURATION									
Less than 5 weeks	3,358	2,981	3,050	3,568	3,233	3,359	3,386	3,439	3,238
5 to 14 weeks	2,452	2,206	1,978	3,012	2,556	2,484	2,539	2,493	2,432
15 weeks and over	4,945	3,337	3,127	4,510	3,201	2,984	2,873	2,855	2,851
15 to 26 weeks	1,979	1,431	1,318	1,778	1,166	1,173	1,114	1,111	1,186
27 weeks and over	2,967	1,906	1,809	2,736	2,035	1,810	1,759	1,744	1,664
Average (mean) duration, in weeks	21.0	20.5	19.9	20.2	20.5	19.8	18.8	18.9	18.8
Median duration, in weeks	12.6	10.0	9.3	11.9	9.2	8.3	8.3	8.1	8.7
PERCENT DISTRIBUTION									
Total unemployed	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Less than 5 weeks	31.3	35.0	37.4	32.2	36.0	38.1	38.5	39.1	38.0
5 to 14 weeks	22.8	25.9	24.3	27.2	28.4	28.1	28.9	28.1	28.5
15 weeks and over	45.9	39.2	38.3	40.7	35.6	33.8	32.7	32.5	33.5
15 to 26 weeks	18.4	16.8	16.2	16.0	13.0	13.3	12.7	12.6	13.9
27 weeks and over	27.6	22.4	22.2	24.7	22.6	20.5	20.0	19.8	19.5

Table A-8. Reason for unemployment

(Numbers in thousands)

Reason	Not seasonally adjusted			Seasonally adjusted					
	May 1983	Apr. 1984	May 1984	May 1983	Jan. 1984	Feb. 1984	Mar. 1984	Apr. 1984	May 1984
NUMBER OF UNEMPLOYED									
Job losers	5,481	4,599	4,119	6,753	4,825	4,737	4,614	4,527	4,327
On layoff	1,750	1,087	1,066	1,958	1,238	1,272	1,254	1,108	1,192
Other job losers	4,631	3,512	3,053	4,795	3,588	3,465	3,360	3,419	3,134
Job leavers	757	727	742	808	809	772	756	781	804
Reentrants	2,355	2,107	2,181	2,404	2,192	2,153	2,208	2,309	2,178
New entrants	1,233	1,092	1,142	1,246	1,175	1,092	1,213	1,216	1,196
PERCENT DISTRIBUTION									
Total unemployed	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Job losers	59.8	53.9	50.5	60.2	53.6	54.1	52.5	51.3	50.9
On layoff	16.3	12.7	13.1	17.5	13.7	14.5	14.3	12.5	14.0
Other job losers	43.5	41.2	37.4	42.8	39.9	39.6	38.2	38.7	34.9
Job leavers	7.0	8.5	9.2	7.2	9.0	8.8	8.6	8.8	9.5
Reentrants	22.9	24.7	26.3	21.4	24.4	24.6	25.1	26.1	25.6
New entrants	11.2	12.8	14.0	11.1	13.1	12.5	13.8	13.8	14.0
UNEMPLOYED AS A PERCENT OF THE CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE									
Job losers	5.8	4.9	3.6	6.1	4.3	4.2	4.1	4.0	3.8
Job leavers	.7	.6	.7	.7	.7	.7	.7	.7	.7
Reentrants	2.1	1.9	1.9	2.2	2.0	1.9	2.0	2.0	1.9
New entrants	1.1	1.0	1.0	1.1	1.0	1.0	1.1	1.1	1.0

Table A-9. Unemployed persons by sex and age, seasonally adjusted

Sex and age	Number of unemployed persons (in thousands)			Unemployment rates[1]					
	May 1983	Apr. 1984	May 1984	May 1983	Jan. 1984	Feb. 1984	Mar. 1984	Apr. 1984	May 1984
Total, 16 years and over	11,168	8,843	8,518	10.1	8.0	7.8	7.9	7.8	7.5
16 to 24 years	4,330	3,522	3,402	18.0	14.8	14.2	14.4	14.6	14.0
16 to 19 years	1,857	1,562	1,529	23.0	19.4	19.3	19.9	19.4	19.0
16 to 17 years	798	683	632	25.6	21.9	22.1	23.1	22.3	20.2
18 to 19 years	1,066	876	896	21.3	17.6	17.5	18.1	17.5	18.2
20 to 24 years	2,473	1,960	1,873	15.5	12.5	11.6	11.6	12.2	11.5
25 years and over	6,838	5,301	5,132	7.9	6.2	6.1	5.9	6.0	5.7
25 to 54 years	6,106	4,663	4,474	8.5	6.5	6.4	6.3	6.3	6.0
55 years and over	733	621	659	5.3	4.7	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.4
Men, 16 years and over	5,633	4,919	4,678	10.5	8.1	7.8	7.7	7.7	7.3
16 to 24 years	2,535	1,925	1,812	19.5	15.6	14.6	14.6	15.0	14.0
16 to 19 years	1,021	824	817	23.9	20.8	19.7	20.0	19.7	19.4
16 to 17 years	435	378	352	26.7	21.6	21.6	23.0	23.7	21.3
18 to 19 years	591	448	472	22.3	19.6	18.1	18.2	17.3	18.3
20 to 24 years	1,514	1,101	995	17.3	13.1	12.1	11.9	12.7	11.5
25 years and over	4,124	2,996	2,878	8.2	6.2	6.1	5.9	5.9	5.7
25 to 54 years	3,602	2,604	2,480	8.8	6.6	6.4	6.1	6.2	5.9
55 years and over	516	382	398	5.8	4.8	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.5
Women, 16 years and over	4,534	3,924	3,836	9.5	7.9	7.8	7.9	7.9	7.7
16 to 24 years	1,825	1,597	1,591	16.3	13.9	13.7	14.2	14.1	14.0
16 to 19 years	835	738	712	22.0	18.0	18.9	19.8	19.0	18.6
16 to 17 years	353	305	280	24.4	22.2	22.6	23.1	20.8	19.0
18 to 19 years	475	428	424	20.2	15.4	16.9	18.1	17.8	18.1
20 to 24 years	990	859	879	13.4	11.7	11.0	11.3	11.6	11.6
25 years and over	2,774	2,305	2,254	7.5	6.2	6.1	6.0	6.0	5.8
25 to 54 years	2,504	2,059	1,994	8.1	6.5	6.5	6.5	6.4	6.1
55 years and over	292	239	266	4.7	4.5	4.0	3.9	3.9	4.3

[1] Unemployment as a percent of the civilian labor force.

HOUSEHOLD DATA

Table A-10. Employment status of black and other workers

(Numbers in thousands)

Employment status	Not seasonally adjusted			Seasonally adjusted[1]					
	May 1983	Apr. 1984	May 1984	May 1983	Jan. 1984	Feb. 1984	Mar. 1984	Apr. 1984	May 1984
Civilian noninstitutional population	23,282	23,791	23,898	23,282	23,594	23,660	23,539	23,791	23,898
Civilian labor force	14,299	14,523	14,847	14,449	14,625	14,593	14,521	14,770	14,976
Participation rate	61.4	61.1	62.1	62.1	61.9	61.8	61.7	62.1	62.7
Employed	11,729	12,380	12,809	11,776	12,179	12,417	12,325	12,541	12,852
Employment-population ratio[2]	53.8	52.1	53.6	50.6	51.6	52.5	52.4	52.7	53.8
Unemployed	2,570	2,144	2,038	2,673	2,246	2,176	2,195	2,229	2,125
Unemployment rate	18.0	14.8	13.7	18.5	15.6	14.9	15.1	15.1	14.2
Not in labor force	8,983	9,263	9,048	8,833	9,169	9,067	9,018	9,021	8,919

[1] The population figures are not adjusted for seasonal variation; therefore, identical numbers appear in the unadjusted and seasonally adjusted columns.

[2] Civilian employment as a percent of the civilian noninstitutional population.

Table A-11. Occupational status of the employed and unemployed, not seasonally adjusted

(Numbers in thousands)

Occupation	Civilian employed		Unemployed		Unemployment rate	
	May 1983	May 1984	May 1983	May 1984	May 1983	May 1984
Total, 16 years and over[1]	99,583	105,096	10,765	8,154	9.8	7.2
Managerial and professional specialty	23,597	24,999	809	628	3.3	2.5
Executive, administrative, and managerial	10,585	11,404	431	324	3.9	2.8
Professional specialty	13,012	13,595	379	304	2.8	2.2
Technical, sales, and administrative support	30,838	32,383	2,109	1,584	6.4	4.7
Technicians and related support	3,062	3,175	143	78	4.5	2.4
Sales occupations	11,599	12,497	820	697	6.6	5.3
Administrative support, including clerical	16,187	16,672	1,146	808	6.6	4.6
Service occupations	13,507	14,235	1,738	1,361	11.4	8.7
Private household	932	1,017	53	51	5.3	4.8
Protective service	1,568	1,594	180	104	8.1	6.3
Service, except private household and protective	10,977	11,673	1,501	1,206	12.3	9.4
Precision production, craft, and repair	11,768	12,992	1,466	1,044	11.1	7.4
Mechanics and repairers	3,976	4,329	323	231	7.5	5.1
Construction trades	4,026	4,505	720	551	15.2	10.9
Other precision production, craft, and repair	3,741	4,158	423	262	10.2	5.9
Operators, fabricators, and laborers	15,891	16,595	3,042	2,038	16.1	10.9
Machine operators, assemblers, and inspectors	7,585	7,912	1,539	916	16.9	10.4
Transportation and material moving occupations	4,247	4,430	553	424	11.5	8.7
Handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers, and laborers	4,059	4,252	950	697	19.0	14.1
Construction laborers	611	664	214	183	25.9	22.1
Other handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers, and laborers	3,448	3,588	737	508	17.6	12.4
Farming, forestry, and fishing	3,965	3,933	338	286	7.9	6.8

[1] Persons with no previous work experience and those whose last job was in the Armed Forces are included in the unemployed total.

Table A-12. Employment status of male Vietnam-era veterans and nonveterans by age, not seasonally adjusted

(Numbers in thousands)

Veteran status and age	Civilian noninstitutional population		Civilian labor force							
			Total		Employed		Unemployed			
							Number		Percent of labor force	
	May 1983	May 1984	May 1983	May 1984	May 1983	May 1984	May 1983	May 1984	May 1983	May 1984
VETERANS										
Total, 25 years and over	7,839	7,921	7,367	7,450	6,668	7,023	699	427	9.5	5.7
25 to 39 years	5,911	5,948	5,661	5,735	5,084	4,993	577	342	10.2	6.0
25 to 29 years	702	595	651	675	562	638	91	37	13.9	5.6
30 to 34 years	2,207	1,783	2,106	1,696	1,874	1,583	232	115	11.0	6.8
35 to 39 years	3,002	3,260	2,902	3,159	2,648	2,972	254	186	8.8	5.9
40 years and over	1,928	2,173	1,706	2,115	1,584	2,030	122	85	7.2	4.0
NONVETERANS										
Total, 25 to 39 years	19,890	20,974	18,775	19,723	17,022	18,523	1,753	1,200	9.3	6.1
25 to 29 years	8,669	8,932	8,132	8,312	7,235	7,765	897	547	11.0	6.6
30 to 34 years	6,712	7,541	6,370	6,949	5,844	6,553	526	396	8.3	5.7
35 to 39 years	4,509	4,721	4,273	4,462	3,943	4,205	330	257	7.7	5.8

NOTE: Male Vietnam-era veterans are men who served in the Armed Forces between August 5, 1964 and May 7, 1975. Nonveterans are men who have never served in the Armed Forces; published data are limited to those 25 to 39 years of age, the group that most closely corresponds to the bulk of the Vietnam-era veteran population.

Table A-13. Employment status of the civilian population for ten large States

(Numbers in thousands)

State and employment status	Not seasonally adjusted[1]			Seasonally adjusted[2]					
	May 1983	Apr. 1984	May 1984	May 1983	Jan. 1984	Feb. 1984	Mar. 1984	Apr. 1984	May 1984
California									
Civilian noninstitutional population	19,760	19,861	19,888	19,760	19,883	19,909	19,935	19,861	19,888
Civilian labor force	12,259	12,373	12,434	12,319	12,395	12,363	12,451	12,458	12,490
Employed	11,044	11,421	11,535	11,035	11,350	11,380	11,425	11,504	11,524
Unemployed	1,216	952	898	1,284	1,045	983	1,026	954	966
Unemployment rate	9.9	7.7	7.2	10.4	8.4	8.0	8.2	7.7	7.7
Florida									
Civilian noninstitutional population	8,314	8,509	8,528	8,314	8,455	8,473	8,491	8,509	8,528
Civilian labor force	4,743	4,933	5,032	4,763	5,067	5,065	5,105	5,004	5,058
Employed	4,331	4,649	4,728	4,333	4,713	4,760	4,826	4,694	4,735
Unemployed	412	283	305	430	354	305	279	310	323
Unemployment rate	8.7	5.7	6.1	9.0	7.0	6.0	5.5	6.2	6.4
Illinois									
Civilian noninstitutional population	8,574	8,592	8,594	8,574	8,588	8,590	8,591	8,592	8,594
Civilian labor force	5,610	5,533	5,581	5,646	5,553	5,599	5,625	5,579	5,617
Employed	4,950	5,005	5,092	4,965	5,005	5,067	5,036	5,021	5,108
Unemployed	660	527	489	681	548	532	589	558	509
Unemployment rate	11.8	9.5	8.8	12.1	9.9	9.5	10.5	10.0	9.1
Massachusetts									
Civilian noninstitutional population	4,482	4,505	4,507	4,482	4,499	4,501	4,503	4,505	4,507
Civilian labor force	2,936	3,016	3,019	2,972	3,028	3,033	3,026	3,099	3,057
Employed	2,744	2,883	2,899	2,777	2,831	2,860	2,865	2,932	2,933
Unemployed	192	133	120	195	197	173	161	167	124
Unemployment rate	6.5	5.0	4.0	6.6	6.5	5.7	5.3	5.4	4.1
Michigan									
Civilian noninstitutional population	6,748	6,729	6,727	6,748	6,736	6,733	6,731	6,729	6,727
Civilian labor force	4,391	4,331	4,395	4,356	4,207	4,305	4,385	4,377	4,356
Employed	3,748	3,852	3,899	3,700	3,722	3,815	3,891	3,911	3,865
Unemployed	643	479	497	656	485	490	494	466	511
Unemployment rate	14.7	11.0	11.3	15.1	11.5	11.4	11.3	10.6	11.7
New Jersey									
Civilian noninstitutional population	5,744	5,786	5,790	5,744	5,776	5,779	5,783	5,786	5,790
Civilian labor force	3,615	3,892	3,846	3,589	3,774	3,811	3,822	3,928	3,861
Employed	3,343	3,636	3,643	3,339	3,503	3,575	3,565	3,661	3,639
Unemployed	272	256	203	250	271	236	257	267	222
Unemployment rate	7.5	6.5	5.3	7.0	7.2	6.2	6.7	6.8	5.7
New York									
Civilian noninstitutional population	13,554	13,618	13,622	13,556	13,605	13,609	13,613	13,618	13,622
Civilian labor force	7,856	7,936	7,990	7,940	7,939	8,024	8,061	7,994	8,074
Employed	7,188	7,420	7,481	7,239	7,353	7,432	7,501	7,461	7,532
Unemployed	669	516	509	701	586	592	560	533	542
Unemployment rate	8.5	6.5	6.4	8.8	7.4	7.4	6.9	6.7	6.7
Ohio									
Civilian noninstitutional population	8,049	8,049	8,050	8,049	8,050	8,050	8,050	8,049	8,050
Civilian labor force	5,153	4,986	5,086	5,153	5,095	5,082	5,025	5,050	5,081
Employed	4,491	4,506	4,593	4,465	4,619	4,607	4,513	4,543	4,562
Unemployed	663	489	493	688	476	475	512	507	519
Unemployment rate	12.9	9.8	9.7	13.4	9.3	9.3	10.2	10.0	10.2
Pennsylvania									
Civilian noninstitutional population	9,180	9,203	9,209	9,180	9,198	9,200	9,202	9,203	9,209
Civilian labor force	5,443	5,317	5,429	5,511	5,451	5,421	5,365	5,394	5,497
Employed	4,782	4,829	4,956	4,822	4,997	4,988	4,847	4,900	4,995
Unemployed	661	488	473	689	454	433	478	494	502
Unemployment rate	12.1	9.2	8.7	12.5	8.3	9.8	8.9	9.2	9.1
Texas									
Civilian noninstitutional population	11,226	11,506	11,532	11,226	11,429	11,455	11,480	11,506	11,532
Civilian labor force	7,472	7,821	7,925	7,533	7,648	7,632	7,817	7,854	7,988
Employed	6,875	7,317	7,482	6,923	7,118	7,199	7,300	7,322	7,531
Unemployed	596	504	442	610	530	433	510	532	457
Unemployment rate	8.0	6.4	5.6	8.1	6.9	5.7	6.5	6.8	5.7

[1] These are the official Bureau of Labor Statistics' estimates used in the administration of Federal fund allocation programs.

[2] The population figures are not adjusted for seasonal variation, therefore, identical numbers appear in the unadjusted and the seasonally adjusted columns.

ESTABLISHMENT DATA

Table B-1. Employees on nonagricultural payrolls by industry

(In thousands)

Industry	Not seasonally adjusted				Seasonally adjusted					
	May 1983	Mar. 1984	Apr. 1984 p	May 1984 p	May 1983	Jan. 1984	Feb. 1984	Mar. 1984	Apr. 1984 p	May 1984 p
Total	89,921	92,214	93,214	94,063	89,578	92,191	92,846	93,058	93,456	93,688
Total private	73,750	76,030	77,016	77,865	73,730	76,531	76,971	77,185	77,551	77,798
Goods-producing	23,069	24,084	24,469	24,849	23,087	24,383	24,577	24,595	24,763	24,856
Mining	938	967	978	991	960	975	978	978	985	993
Oil and gas extraction	583.8	603.3	605.3	612.4	589	608	607	607	615	619
Construction	3,861	3,794	4,060	4,319	3,849	4,154	4,226	4,151	4,247	4,306
General building contractors	981.4	1,010.8	1,056.0	1,124.3	986	1,100	1,111	1,099	1,109	1,129
Manufacturing	18,270	19,323	19,431	19,539	18,298	19,254	19,373	19,466	19,531	19,557
Production workers	12,396	13,280	13,368	13,471	12,408	13,234	13,326	13,388	13,445	13,475
Durable goods	10,640	11,456	11,533	11,613	10,623	11,343	11,440	11,513	11,553	11,590
Production workers	7,046	7,736	7,796	7,869	7,020	7,643	7,718	7,769	7,804	7,836
Lumber and wood products	645.2	688.0	700.5	714.4	643	732	706	712	714	712
Furniture and fixtures	439.3	480.5	482.0	482.4	441	475	480	483	482	484
Stone, clay, and glass products	570.4	585.8	594.0	604.3	567	595	604	606	605	605
Primary metal industries	831.9	881.2	887.1	891.6	827	871	877	877	880	887
Blast furnaces and basic steel products	343.5	347.9	349.6	350.5	341	347	348	347	346	347
Fabricated metal products	1,353.4	1,449.8	1,456.9	1,467.3	1,355	1,440	1,447	1,456	1,460	1,467
Machinery, except electrical	2,017.8	2,177.3	2,192.9	2,203.1	2,014	2,137	2,151	2,166	2,189	2,199
Electrical and electronic equipment	1,984.1	2,188.4	2,206.8	2,224.5	1,989	2,152	2,175	2,202	2,213	2,229
Transportation equipment	1,739.9	1,907.6	1,905.3	1,914.2	1,727	1,876	1,898	1,905	1,903	1,901
Motor vehicles and equipment	744.1	863.0	855.0	863.4	732	858	865	863	856	847
Instruments and related products	688.2	714.8	717.2	719.8	690	711	715	718	719	721
Miscellaneous manufacturing	369.9	383.0	385.9	384.4	370	384	387	388	384	385
Nondurable goods	7,630	7,867	7,898	7,926	7,675	7,911	7,933	7,953	7,978	7,967
Production workers	5,350	5,544	5,572	5,602	5,388	5,591	5,608	5,619	5,641	5,639
Food and kindred products	1,575.6	1,575.7	1,582.3	1,596.4	1,621	1,638	1,637	1,639	1,647	1,641
Tobacco manufactures	64.2	63.6	62.4	62.3	70	66	65	66	67	67
Textile mill products	736.4	763.9	765.9	763.7	736	768	767	769	767	763
Apparel and other textile products	1,15 .5	1,215.5	1,220.1	1,220.8	1,149	1,207	1,213	1,218	1,225	1,216
Paper and allied products	657.0	676.8	677.1	678.5	658	676	680	680	680	681
Printing and publishing	1,286.8	1,341.6	1,349.0	1,350.8	1,288	1,328	1,333	1,339	1,348	1,352
Chemicals and allied products	1,046.0	1,053.2	1,056.9	1,053.5	1,045	1,053	1,054	1,054	1,058	1,057
Petroleum and coal products	197.0	186.2	187.2	189.2	197	191	190	190	189	189
Rubber and miscellaneous plastics products	705.7	785.1	790.0	797.5	704	774	784	790	789	795
Leather and leather products	207.7	205.5	207.0	206.8	207	210	213	209	208	206
Service-producing	66,852	68,130	68,765	69,214	66,491	68,008	68,269	68,463	68,693	68,832
Transportation and public utilities	5,000	5,055	5,096	5,142	5,001	5,095	5,105	5,112	5,131	5,141
Transportation	2,733	2,793	2,837	2,875	2,728	2,816	2,829	2,839	2,863	2,869
Communication and public utilities	2,267	2,262	2,259	2,267	2,273	2,279	2,276	2,273	2,268	2,272
Wholesale trade	5,214	5,421	5,450	5,489	5,220	5,406	5,438	5,457	5,474	5,496
Durable goods	3,034	3,192	3,212	3,242	3,033	3,168	3,193	3,205	3,218	3,242
Nondurable goods	2,180	2,229	2,238	2,247	2,187	2,238	2,245	2,252	2,256	2,254
Retail trade	15,427	15,629	15,917	16,117	15,433	15,914	15,930	16,030	16,096	16,117
General merchandise stores	2,073.0	2,140.5	2,158.0	2,179.5	2,142	2,210	2,211	2,230	2,241	2,252
Food stores	2,539.2	2,592.2	2,610.4	2,620.7	2,549	2,618	2,626	2,626	2,637	2,631
Automotive dealers and service stations	1,651.1	1,722.0	1,736.4	1,756.3	1,648	1,729	1,740	1,748	1,763	1,753
Eating and drinking places	5,078.1	4,966.4	5,152.6	5,261.2	4,972	5,111	5,121	5,136	5,158	5,153
Finance, insurance, and real estate	5,441	5,565	5,594	5,628	5,460	5,573	5,593	5,613	5,640	5,650
Finance	2,717	2,816	2,822	2,832	2,743	2,797	2,812	2,831	2,851	2,861
Insurance	1,718	1,740	1,740	1,743	1,718	1,737	1,741	1,742	1,742	1,743
Real estate	1,006	1,008	1,032	1,053	999	1,039	1,040	1,041	1,047	1,046
Services	19,599	20,276	20,490	20,620	19,529	20,162	20,278	20,378	20,449	20,538
Business services	3,455.4	3,836.3	3,871.8	3,954.4	3,474	3,798	3,845	3,875	3,903	3,976
Health services	5,955.9	6,033.9	6,043.6	6,059.9	5,973	6,030	6,040	6,052	6,062	6,069
Government	14,171	14,204	14,218	14,218	15,848	15,858	15,875	15,873	15,905	15,890
Federal	2,756	2,756	2,767	2,770	2,753	2,764	2,763	2,770	2,773	2,767
State	3,701	3,785	3,785	3,753	3,452	3,470	3,492	3,686	3,693	3,701
Local	9,714	9,662	9,666	9,695	9,443	9,428	9,430	9,417	9,439	9,422

p = preliminary

NOTE: Data in this table have been revised to reflect March 1983 benchmarks and updated seasonal adjustment factors and are not comparable with previously published data. See the note on page 3.

ESTABLISHMENT DATA

Table B-2. Average weekly hours of production or nonsupervisory workers[1] on private nonagricultural payrolls by industry

Industry	Not seasonally adjusted				Seasonally adjusted					
	May 1983	Mar. 1984	Apr. 1984 p	May 1984 p	May 1983	Jan. 1984	Feb. 1984	Mar. 1984	Apr. 1984 p	May 1984 p
Total private	34.9	35.0	35.1	35.3	34.9	35.4	35.3	35.3	35.5	35.3
Mining	42.2	42.8	42.9	43.2	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Construction	37.5	36.7	37.6	38.0	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Manufacturing	39.9	40.7	40.9	40.7	39.9	40.9	40.9	40.7	41.2	40.7
Overtime hours	2.7	3.4	3.4	3.3	2.7	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.7	3.4
Durable goods	40.4	41.4	41.7	41.4	40.3	41.6	41.7	41.4	41.6	41.4
Overtime hours	2.6	3.6	3.6	3.5	2.6	3.7	3.8	3.7	4.0	3.5
Lumber and wood products	40.2	39.9	40.3	40.1	39.8	40.6	40.4	40.1	40.5	39.6
Furniture and fixtures	39.0	39.5	39.6	39.4	39.2	40.9	39.9	39.6	39.8	39.6
Stone, clay, and glass products	41.4	41.6	42.2	42.5	41.2	42.1	42.5	41.9	42.3	42.2
Primary metal industries	40.0	42.0	42.4	42.2	40.2	41.9	42.0	41.8	42.2	42.4
Blast furnaces and basic steel products	38.9	41.2	42.0	41.8	39.2	41.0	41.3	41.2	40.9	42.1
Fabricated metal products	40.1	41.3	41.5	41.4	40.3	41.6	41.8	41.3	41.8	41.4
Machinery, except electrical	39.9	42.0	42.1	41.7	40.0	41.8	41.9	41.9	42.3	41.8
Electrical and electronic equipment	40.1	41.0	41.0	40.9	40.2	41.2	41.2	41.0	41.3	41.0
Transportation equipment	41.9	43.0	43.4	43.0	41.6	43.2	43.1	42.9	43.5	42.7
Motor vehicles and equipment	43.3	44.4	44.9	44.2	42.6	44.8	44.3	44.4	44.8	43.4
Instruments and related products	40.3	41.2	41.1	40.7	40.3	41.3	41.2	41.1	41.4	40.7
Miscellaneous manufacturing	38.8	39.6	39.6	39.3	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Nondurable goods	39.3	39.6	39.8	39.6	39.4	39.9	39.9	39.8	40.2	39.7
Overtime hours	2.8	3.1	3.1	3.0	2.9	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.4	3.1
Food and kindred products	39.3	39.3	39.5	39.5	39.4	39.7	39.7	39.8	40.1	39.6
Tobacco manufactures	37.4	36.9	39.5	40.1	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Textile mill products	40.6	40.4	40.6	40.2	40.5	40.6	40.8	40.6	41.3	40.1
Apparel and other textile products	36.1	36.7	36.8	36.5	36.1	36.6	36.9	36.7	37.4	36.5
Paper and allied products	42.5	42.7	42.9	42.9	42.7	43.2	43.2	43.0	43.1	43.1
Printing and publishing	37.3	38.0	38.1	37.8	37.5	37.9	37.9	37.9	38.3	38.0
Chemicals and allied products	41.5	41.9	42.0	41.9	41.6	42.1	42.1	42.0	42.0	41.9
Petroleum and coal products	43.7	43.6	44.2	44.2	43.6	44.8	44.5	44.7	44.0	44.1
Rubber and miscellaneous plastics products	41.1	41.7	42.1	41.7	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Leather and leather products	37.1	36.1	37.2	37.5	36.8	37.5	37.2	36.7	37.7	37.1
Transportation and public utilities	38.7	39.0	39.3	39.2	38.9	39.5	39.3	39.2	39.5	39.4
Wholesale trade	38.4	38.3	38.5	38.5	38.5	38.6	38.5	38.5	38.7	38.5
Retail trade	29.7	29.6	29.9	30.1	29.8	30.1	30.0	30.1	30.1	30.2
Finance, insurance, and real estate	36.3	36.3	36.4	36.2	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Services	32.6	32.6	32.7	32.6	32.7	32.8	32.7	32.8	32.8	32.7

[1] Data relate to production workers in mining and manufacturing; to construction workers in construction; and to nonsupervisory workers in transportation and public utilities; wholesale and retail trade; finance, insurance, and real estate; and services. These groups account for approximately four-fifths of the total employees on private nonagricultural payrolls.

[2] This series is not published seasonally adjusted since the seasonal component is small relative to the trend-cycle and/or irregular components and consequently cannot be separated with sufficient precision.

p = preliminary.

NOTE: Data in this table have been revised to reflect March 1983 benchmarks and updated seasonal adjustment factors and are not comparable with previously published data. See the note on page 3

ESTABLISHMENT DATA

Table B-3. Average hourly and weekly earnings of production or nonsupervisory workers[1] on private nonagricultural payrolls by industry

Industry	Average hourly earnings				Average weekly earnings			
	May 1983	Mar. 1984	Apr. 1984 p	May 1984 p	May 1983	Mar. 1984	Apr. 1984 p	May 1984 p
Total private	$7.98	$8.24	$8.29	$8.28	$278.50	$288.40	$292.64	$292.28
Seasonally adjusted	7.98	8.25	8.31	8.28	278.50	291.23	295.01	292.28
Mining	11.17	11.60	11.60	11.63	471.37	496.48	497.64	502.42
Construction	11.41	11.97	11.94	11.92	442.88	439.30	448.94	452.96
Manufacturing	8.77	9.09	9.11	9.12	349.92	369.96	372.60	371.18
Durable goods	9.31	9.66	9.67	9.67	376.12	399.92	403.24	400.34
Lumber and wood products	7.77	7.87	7.88	7.90	312.35	314.01	317.56	316.79
Furniture and fixtures	6.52	6.76	6.75	6.74	254.28	267.02	267.30	267.13
Stone, clay, and glass products	9.19	9.40	9.50	9.53	390.47	389.16	400.90	405.03
Primary metal industries	11.28	11.44	11.51	11.49	451.20	480.48	488.02	484.88
Blast furnaces and basic steel products	12.74	12.97	13.13	13.12	495.59	534.36	551.46	548.42
Fabricated metal products	9.06	9.31	9.34	9.32	365.12	384.50	387.61	385.85
Machinery, except electrical	9.51	9.90	9.92	9.93	379.45	415.80	417.63	414.08
Electrical and electronic equipment	8.58	8.88	8.89	8.89	344.06	364.08	364.49	363.60
Transportation equipment	11.51	12.12	12.05	12.05	482.27	521.16	522.97	518.15
Motor vehicles and equipment	11.97	12.62	12.55	12.52	518.30	560.33	563.50	553.38
Instruments and related products	9.19	8.71	8.73	8.70	338.12	358.85	358.80	354.99
Miscellaneous manufacturing	6.80	6.97	6.96	7.01	263.84	276.01	275.62	275.49
Nondurable goods	8.04	8.27	8.29	8.31	315.97	327.49	329.96	329.08
Food and kindred products	8.21	8.39	8.43	8.42	322.45	329.73	332.98	332.59
Tobacco manufactures	10.78	11.29	11.41	11.54	403.17	416.60	450.70	462.75
Textile mill products	6.14	6.41	6.43	6.41	249.28	258.96	261.06	257.68
Apparel and other textile products	5.33	5.48	5.48	5.46	192.41	201.12	201.66	199.29
Paper and allied products	9.91	10.25	10.29	10.35	416.93	437.68	441.44	444.02
Printing and publishing	9.04	9.29	9.30	9.28	337.19	353.02	354.33	350.78
Chemicals and allied products	10.50	10.95	10.97	11.02	435.75	458.81	460.74	461.74
Petroleum and coal products	13.16	13.44	13.43	13.33	575.97	585.98	593.61	589.19
Rubber and miscellaneous plastics products	7.94	8.20	8.25	8.27	326.33	341.94	347.33	344.86
Leather and leather products	5.52	5.68	5.67	5.71	204.79	205.05	210.92	214.13
Transportation and public utilities	10.73	11.02	11.07	11.09	415.25	429.78	435.05	436.73
Wholesale trade	8.49	8.79	8.89	8.85	326.02	336.66	342.27	340.73
Retail trade	5.72	5.89	5.89	5.87	169.88	174.34	176.11	176.69
Finance, insurance, and real estate	7.29	7.54	7.63	7.55	264.63	273.70	279.26	273.31
Services	7.27	7.54	7.60	7.54	237.00	245.80	248.52	245.80

[1] See footnote 1, table B-2.

p = preliminary.

Table B-4. Hourly Earnings Index for production or nonsupervisory workers[1] on private nonagricultural payrolls by industry

(1977 = 100)

Industry	Not seasonally adjusted					Seasonally adjusted						
	May 1983	Mar. 1984	Apr. 1984p	May 1984p	Percent change from: May 1983-May 1984	May 1983	Jan. 1984	Feb. 1984	Mar. 1984	Apr. 1984p	May 1984p	Percent change from: Apr. 1984-May 1984
Total private nonfarm:												
Current dollars	154.7	158.9	159.8	159.6	3.2	154.7	158.4	158.5	159.1	159.9	159.6	-0.2
Constant (1977) dollars	94.7	95.1	95.6	N.A.	(2)	94.8	94.8	94.8	95.1	95.4	N.A.	(3)
Mining	164.7	172.0	172.8	173.6	5.4	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)
Construction	144.1	145.3	145.4	145.5	1.0	144.8	146.1	146.2	146.3	146.5	146.2	-.2
Manufacturing	157.1	161.1	161.6	161.9	2.9	157.3	160.3	160.7	161.2	161.6	161.9	.2
Transportation and public utilities	155.6	160.2	160.8	161.1	3.6	156.2	159.9	159.8	160.9	161.3	161.7	.3
Wholesale trade	157.3	162.7	164.6	163.9	4.2	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)
Retail trade	150.2	153.4	154.2	153.9	2.5	149.6	152.7	152.9	153.2	153.7	153.3	-.3
Finance, insurance, and real estate	158.7	164.2	165.9	164.5	3.6	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)
Services	155.5	160.8	162.3	161.5	3.9	155.3	159.8	159.5	160.8	162.3	161.3	-.6

1 See footnote 1, table B-2.

2 Percent change is .6 percent from April 1983 to April 1984, the latest month available.

3 Percent change is .3 percent from March 1984 to April 1984, the latest month available.

4 These series are not seasonally adjusted since the seasonal component is small relative to the trend-cycle and/or irregular components and consequently cannot be separated with sufficient precision.

N.A. = not available.

p = preliminary.

NOTE: Data in these tables have been revised to reflect March 1983 benchmarks and updated seasonal adjustment factors and are not comparable with previously publish ed data. See the note on page 1.

ESTABLISHMENT DATA

Table B-5. Indexes of aggregate weekly hours of production or nonsupervisory workers[1] on private nonagricultural payrolls by industry

(1977 = 100)

Industry	Not seasonally adjusted				Seasonally adjusted					
	May 1983	Mar. 1984	Apr. 1984 p	May 1984 p	May 1983	Jan. 1984	Feb. 1984	Mar. 1984	Apr. 1984 p	May 1984 p
Total	104.4	108.3	110.6	111.9	104.7	110.3	110.9	110.9	112.1	111.9
Goods-producing	89.6	95.4	98.1	99.9	89.4	97.9	99.2	98.1	100.2	99.6
Mining	103.9	109.9	111.5	114.5	104.8	111.5	112.1	111.7	114.4	115.4
Construction	100.4	95.4	106.2	115.8	99.0	110.3	114.1	107.7	112.9	113.7
Manufacturing	86.8	94.7	95.9	96.1	86.9	96.9	95.7	95.7	97.0	96.1
Durable goods	83.5	94.1	95.4	95.7	83.1	93.4	94.4	94.5	95.9	95.2
Lumber and wood products	87.9	93.6	96.4	98.0	86.7	97.4	97.4	97.8	98.8	96.5
Furniture and fixtures	91.2	101.9	102.6	102.1	92.0	102.0	102.8	102.8	103.3	102.8
Stone, clay, and glass products	81.5	84.1	87.9	90.2	80.7	87.1	89.3	88.2	89.4	89.9
Primary metal industries	65.1	74.2	75.3	75.3	64.9	72.8	73.5	73.2	74.2	75.2
Blast furnaces and basic steel products	57.1	63.0	64.7	64.9	57.1	62.3	62.6	62.4	62.3	64.4e
Fabricated metal products	80.5	89.7	90.8	91.3	80.5	89.5	90.4	89.9	91.5	91.3
Machinery, except electrical	90.0	94.1	95.2	95.1	90.0	91.1	92.3	93.3	95.2	95.0
Electrical and electronic equipment	96.9	111.8	112.8	113.6	96.9	109.6	111.2	112.2	113.6	113.9
Transportation equipment	93.4	96.6	97.0	96.9	81.5	95.1	95.9	95.5	96.8	96.7
Motor vehicles and equipment	74.8	92.4	92.0	91.6	71.7	93.0	92.8	92.7	91.7	87.5
Instruments and related products	101.8	108.4	108.5	107.8	101.9	108.5	108.8	108.8	109.6	108.0
Miscellaneous manufacturing	79.5	84.5	85.5	85.0	80.0	85.0	86.5	85.8	86.8	85.3
Nondurable goods	91.4	95.6	96.6	96.7	92.4	97.0	97.5	97.4	98.8	97.5
Food and kindred products	91.1	91.1	92.2	93.2	94.9	97.0	96.9	97.1	98.6	97.2
Tobacco manufactures	83.7	80.5	84.1	85.3	92.1	87.6	86.1	87.6	93.4	93.1
Textile mill products	80.4	83.7	84.3	83.2	80.3	84.5	84.8	84.5	86.0	83.0
Apparel and other textile products	87.7	94.1	94.8	94.2	87.4	93.2	94.4	94.2	96.6	93.8
Paper and allied products	94.0	97.8	98.4	98.9	94.6	98.8	99.4	99.1	99.1	99.5
Printing and publishing	107.8	115.4	116.4	115.6	108.5	113.8	114.1	114.6	116.7	116.1
Chemicals and allied products	93.6	95.6	96.2	96.5	93.5	96.1	96.3	96.1	96.2	96.1
Petroleum and coal products	93.1	84.1	86.0	90.2	92.5	89.4	88.8	88.4	87.1	89.6
Rubber and miscellaneous plastics products	98.2	111.5	113.5	113.7	97.8	111.0	112.5	112.2	113.8	113.3
Leather and leather products	79.7	77.0	80.0	80.5	78.5	81.4	81.2	79.7	81.8	79.1
Service-producing	113.0	115.4	117.6	118.6	113.1	117.2	117.4	117.9	118.7	118.8
Transportation and public utilities	99.7	101.1	102.9	103.9	100.1	103.4	103.1	103.1	104.4	104.2
Wholesale trade	106.7	110.8	112.1	113.1	107.1	111.6	112.0	112.5	113.3	113.3
Retail trade	104.7	105.2	108.2	110.5	105.1	109.3	109.4	109.9	110.6	110.9
Finance, insurance, and real estate	118.6	120.9	122.7	122.6	119.0	122.0	122.1	122.2	123.4	122.4
Services	125.4	129.5	131.4	131.6	125.1	129.4	129.9	130.9	131.4	131.5

[1] See footnote 1, table B-2.

p = preliminary.

Table B-6. Indexes of diffusion: Percent of industries in which employment[1] increased

Time span	Year	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.
Over 1-month span	1982	27.6	47.6	35.7	31.1	41.1	33.5	34.6	32.4	37.3	28.9	32.4	45.7
	1983	54.3	46.5	60.8	68.9	69.5	64.6	74.3	68.6	69.5	75.4	69.7	73.8
	1984	71.1	73.2	67.0	64.4p	58.4p							
Over 3-month span	1982	25.1	27.8	27.8	27.3	27.6	28.6	23.5	24.1	26.5	25.9	27.8	41.6
	1983	46.8	57.3	64.1	75.1	75.7	77.8	74.1	81.4	80.8	78.9	79.5	77.4
	1984	82.2	80.5	77.3p	69.2p								
Over 6-month span	1982	19.2	22.2	21.9	24.6	20.3	21.4	21.4	18.6	23.2	27.3	29.5	35.4
	1983	50.8	63.0	69.2	75.1	80.0	82.4	84.1	92.4	84.6	85.9	86.8	83.8
	1984	91.9p	82.4p										
Over 12-month span	1982	21.6	21.4	17.6	18.1	16.2	18.1	21.1	21.1	25.1	31.6	34.1	40.3
	1983	49.5	54.3	61.9	71.1	77.3	79.5	83.8	88.1	84.8	87.6p	84.3p	
	1984												

[1] Number of employees, seasonally adjusted for 1, 3, and 6 month spans, on payrolls of 185 private nonagricultural industries.

p = preliminary.

NOTE: Figures are the percent of industries with employment rising. (Half of the unchanged components are counted as rising.) Data are centered within the spans. Data in these tables have been revised to reflect March 1983 benchmarks and updated seasonal adjustment factors and are not comparable with previously published data. See the note on page 3.

Representative LUNGREN. Thank you very much, Madam Commissioner. I would just say that we will alternate 7-minute time limits here for questions.

In previous months you have described the recovery in employment conditions as widespread. I take it from your information that you've given us today that this description still holds.

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes, sir.

Representative LUNGREN. And you have also discussed the BLS diffusion index. What proportion of industries experienced employment gains in May, and what is the significance of that?

Ms. NORWOOD. Almost 60 percent, 58.4 percent, of the some 185 industries that are included in the diffusion index had job growth—job increases. This index, which is somewhat volatile at times, is somewhat less than the 64 percent that was registered the month before, but it is still quite high. It does show some slowdown, however.

Representative LUNGREN. You have indicated that over the last 18 months we have recovered about two-thirds of the number of jobs lost during the recession in the manufacturing sector.

What is the percentage increase that we have seen in the services and retail trade? You gave us some numbers, but I just wonder how they relate to the universe of jobs that we're dealing with there.

Ms. NORWOOD. It's whopping increase in services. Part of the problem in answering that question specifically is that the services industry in particular did not decline in the question. It continued to grow. The service producing sector did decline by roughly 150,000 during the recession and it just had such a whopping increase—more than 3 million—that you almost can't look at it in percentage terms.

Representative LUNGREN. So this indicates that in this recovery, although we are strongly recoverying in the manufacturing sector—we have come back two-thirds—in the services and retail trade, we have just continued to grow and grow and grow. This is consistent with a number of reports that have come out. A recent Brookings Institute study, for example, shows that while many say we have deindustrialized overall, the truth is that we are getting a larger growth in the nonmanufacturing sector as we maintain or increase the number of jobs in manufacturing.

Ms. NORWOOD. Well, I do think you're quite right in suggesting that we distinguish between the rate of growth and the level of jobs. Manufacturing is always very much affected by recession and it takes some time after a recession for manufacturing to regain the level of jobs that it had before, and we are seeing that now perhaps a little bit more than we have seen in the past because of some of the structural changes that are going on in the goods producing sector.

Over the long run, the level of jobs in manufacturing is not declining. What is happening is that there's such strong growth in the service producing sector that the proportion of jobs in the good producing sector is being reduced.

Representative LUNGREN. Let me ask you a question about one subset of the area of services and that is the temporary or flexible services sector. This section includes individuals—I don't want to

define them as Kelly girls—who don't have a commitment to work from 9 to 5 every day, and often work in different locations on a fairly regular basis.

Do you have any statistics that show us whether in fact this is a minimal or substantial element in the growth of the service sector?

Ms. NORWOOD. We do see in the microdata a shift in that sense. Business sevices are becoming much more important. Some of them are temporary, some of them are not, of course. Mr. Plewes perhaps has something more he could add to that.

Mr. PLEWES. During the course of the recovery the personnel supply industry has accounted for one out of every seventeen jobs gained in the recovery, and 10 percent of the total job increase in the service producing sector. It's quite a small industry. It started out about 535,000 and it's now about 830,000. It's one of the fastest growing industries that we have.

Representative LUNGREN. Have we had a chance to analyze what that means? Would these people otherwise be taking traditional permanent jobs, or are these people breaking into the labor force for the first time desiring this type of employment?

Mr. PLEWES. We have some evidence from some studies that were done back in 1979 that both things were happening, that some industries are indeed shifting to temporary help as a substitute for permanent employees because of perhaps trying to avoid some of the costs of fringe benefits of more permanent employees, but others are simply responding to the needs of workers, particularly workers who want to work on a part-time basis, to have this kind of employment. So you see both demand and supply pushing it.

Representative LUNGREN. But are we seeing a substantial increase in that sector?

Mr. PLEWES. Absolutely.

Ms. NORWOOD. One of the results or effects of that may well be that some of the employment that we might have been seeing in manufacturing is being reported in the business services industry. That is, rather than hiring more people on a permanent basis, employers may be using temporary help more frequently.

Representative LUNGREN. Ms. Norwood, as you noted in your testimony, the survey week for the month of May fell rather early and you indicated that that might provide some basis for an overstatement in the employment gains for May. These gains of 890,000, based on the other figures we have seen in prior months, appear to be staggering.

Do you feel that the fact that it fell early in the month is a major factor in explaining the impressive seasonally adjusted May data, or do you think that the data, even taking that into account, expresses real, substantial improvements in the employment picture in the month of May?

Ms. NORWOOD. Well, as I said in my statement, I do believe that there is very strong employment growth, perhaps not 890,000 but somewhere between what the two surveys are showing. It's not entirely a question of seasonal adjustment, although there are certainly problems of that kind at this time of the year.

Representative LUNGREN. Don't we experience these problems every May?

Ms. NORWOOD. Well, yes, but generally June and January are the 2 months for which it is hardest of all to adjust. On the unemployment side, the fact that the survey week was early could have had some effect. However, a review of the data by individual age of the workers shows that most of the improvement in unemployment was among the 25- to 54-year age group who are not typically part of seasonal expansion. There was some improvement in unemployment for the 20- to 24-year age group, who could have been perhaps affected by seasonal adjustment, or during the survey week might have been out of the labor force and would come in later, but the bulk of the improvement in unemployment is clearly among the mature age workers.

Representative LUNGREN. Senator Proxmire.

Senator PROXMIRE. Thank you, Congressman.

Commissioner Norwood, the most startling development we have here seems to me to be in the statistical contrast between the household survey and the business survey. That's a very, very stunning difference. You report that in the household survey employment in May grew by 890,000 which was an unusually large increase for one month, much bigger than the increase in jobs reported by the payroll survey. You comment that seasonal factors may have overstated the May figures.

Can you tell us by much much and is the drop in unemployment also overstated possibly?

Ms. NORWOOD. Let's take employment first. That's the more difficult number really in this month. There is certainly a surge in the household survey, almost 890,000. we have had such surges before. In fact, we don't have to go back very far. In the month of February we had a 700,000 increase in employment.

Senator PROXMIRE. This is much bigger than that. This is 890,000.

Ms. NORWOOD. I realize that.

Senator PROXMIRE. Is this the biggest in recent years?

Ms. NORWOOD. It is very large, there's no question about it. As I said I my statement, I think it may be somewhat overstated.

But I would point out that we generally have in the household survey sometimes a large increase followed by more moderate increases thereafter. For example, in January——

Senator PROXMIRE. Could I interrupt to say that what I'm concerned about is the contrast between the business survey which is relatively modest, 230,000, and the household survey which is almost three times as big, 890,000—more than three times as big.

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes, Senator Proxmire. That's what I was getting at. What we have had in the past in the household survey frequently is roughly an increase of 250,000 to 300,000 jobs and then a surge of some 700,000. This time it's 900,000. It's possible that next month there will be a somewhat smaller increase. I don't know. One needs really to average this over a period of several months in order to come up with a more valid figure.

The establishment survey, on the other hand, tends often to understate new employment, new firms coming into being, which is where a lot of the new employment develops. We do think that we have a fairly good statistical procedure to adjust for that bias, but

we can't be sure about it, and I think we just need to take the data over a period of several months before deciding where we are.

On the other side, the unemployment side, it is possible that because the survey week was early that there were fewer young people coming into the labor force looking for work, and that they would show up next month, except that when you look at the data by age group, there was practically no drop in unemployment among the 16- to 19-year-olds, which is where you would expect to find it if there were indeed a serious seasonal adjustment problem.

There may have been some overstatement because of the 20- to 24-year age group, but as I said before, most of the drop in unemployment was among the 25- to 54-year age group.

Senator PROXMIRE. Well, wouldn't it follow that if there's an increase in employment by almost 900,000 and that is overstated, if it is, there would also be an overstatement of the improvement in unemployment?

Ms. NORWOOD. Well, the labor force would be affected but, as you know, Senator Proxmire, we do measure employment and unemployment separately, and the fact that a person responds that he or she is employed means that it would be very unlikely that that person, if there were some error, would reply that he or she was in fact unemployed.

Senator PROXMIRE. I might point out also that the bias that you mentioned from undercounting new firms in the payroll survey should have been reduced in May because the payroll survey underwent its annual revision. Isn't that right?

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes, that's correct, except as you know, the benchmark is back in March 1983. So March 1983 was the time of the benchmark. And, by the way, we are very proud of the fact that we've made some very important improvements in that benchmark in getting the quarterly reports on wages and salaries more quickly in order to use more of it in the benchmark process. We do have an adjustment factor for new firms since March and I think probably we do a pretty good job of that.

All I was doing was trying to point out all the possibilities. The truth is probably employment is truly somewhere between those two numbers.

Senator PROXMIRE. Let me ask a political question. The civilian unemployment rate which fell to 7.5 percent in May, as I pointed out earlier, is now at the same level as it was in January 1981 when President Reagan took office.

How do jobless rates now compare with those in January 1981 for each worker group—that is, adult men, adult women, whites, blacks, Hispanics, white teenagers, minority teenagers, and so forth? Are they about the same also, or has there been—I think that if I could anticipate your answer a little—that adult men and adult women is about the same, but that blacks are worse off—significantly worse off.

Ms. NORWOOD. Teenagers are about the same. Adult women are about the same. Adult men are slightly higher now than they were then, 6.5 compared to 6.1. The white population is somewhat lower than it was, 6.4 compared to 6.7; and the black population is still above the level of January 1981 by a considerable amount; and Hispanics are about the same.

Senator PROXMIRE. And then for the record, but you don't have to give it to me orally now, but for the record, would you provide jobless rates of the 10 largest States compared to those of January 1981?

Ms. NORWOOD. Certainly.

[The following information was subsequently supplied for the record:]

UNEMPLOYMENT RATES, SEASONALLY ADJUSTED, FOR 10 LARGEST STATES

	January 1981	May 1984
California	7.3	7.7
Florida	6.0	6.4
Illinois	9.0	9.1
Massachusetts	5.4	4.1
Michigan	12.7	11.7
New Jersey	7.6	5.7
New York	7.7	6.7
Ohio	9.6	10.2
Pennsylvania	8.0	9.1
Texas	5.3	5.7

Senator PROXMIRE. Now how much of the employment growth since the trough of the recession can be traced to increased expenditures on defense? I understand real defense purchases have risen 25 percent in real terms, allowing for inflation, between 1982 and 1983. That undoubtedly increased employment. Can you give us some notion of how much?

Ms. NORWOOD. We don't know. We have tried, Senator Proxmire, to track that by looking at the establishments that have defense contracts. It's a very difficult thing to do because, as you're much more aware than I of the methods of financing and so on, there is a lot of subcontracting that goes on.

Senator PROXMIRE. Is it fair to make a rough approximation taking, say, not $25,000 a job because they would probably cost more to get a job in defense, but say $50,000 a job, an then compute the amount of money spent and then figure out the number of jobs that might be the result of that increase? If we do that—I haven't made the calculation, but I think we would have a very, very substantial part of the improvement.

Ms. NORWOOD. I assume you are making no allowance for materials costs or all of the other costs that would be involved. I don't quite see how you can use the salary cost.

Senator PROXMIRE. Well, making an allowance for it, the average defense worker isn't making anything like $50,000, as you know, but for each job I think it's close to that for defense. It's maybe $25,000 in other areas.

Ms. NORWOOD. I really don't know, Senator Proxmire. It's quite clear that many of the establishments with defense contracts have had increased employment. How much of this is related to that, I don't know.

Senator PROXMIRE. My time is up. I'll be back.

Representative LUNGREN. Thank you, Senator. I thought that might be something I could pursue. I'm not sure you're suggesting

we should have higher defense spending here to reduce unemployment. President Kennedy's approach was to spend 50 percent of the national budget on defense and thereby get rid of unemployment. I'm not sure that's what we want to do.

Senator PROXMIRE. That's an exaggeration.

Representative LUNGREN. Forty-eight percent, I think it was.

Commissioner Norwood, you've already mentioned the Bureau has completed its annual revision of the establishment survey data. Can you tell us what it showed us? Did it in any way contradict the growth in employment that we have seen? Isn't it simply a refining of the month-to-month data?

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes, it is, and it actually raised the employment. Mr. Plewes, who is responsible for all that, knows it much better than I.

Representative LUNGREN. Mr. Plewes.

Mr. PLEWES. There were three things done in the revision that we had this time. One is the usual benchmark adjustment which is to adjust the estimates to what we might call a complete census of employment that was available to us as of March 1983. So we adjusted the series to that point and then we were also able, because of some improvements the Commissioner was talking about, to make some estimates of what the second and third quarter complete counts showed for employment.

We also have refined the method we use for adjusting for the lack of ability to capture new firm growth—we call it the bias adjustment and we reseasonalized the data.

The net monthly effect, on average, was to add 37,000 to employment over the March 1983 to March 1984 period. So we had essentially understated the amount of employment growth in the establishment survey prior to our latest benchmark. However, the benchmark revisions didn't change the pattern very much.

If you look at the difference between the estimates before revision and as revised for February 1984 which was the last month for which we published the unrevised data, the difference was about 472,000. Employment not only increased but it also brought the establishment series at that time closer to the household survey. That's one thing we've been talking about for some time.

Representative LUNGREN. You have given us these figures from month-to-month, and now, after an 18-month period, you make your adjustment. As you look back and see if in fact there was any substantial departure from trends or statistical data that we received, is it correct that you missed by about 37,000 on the short side?

Mr. PLEWES. On a monthly basis.

Ms. NORWOOD. Overall, on the aggregate. Of course, there were some differences within industries. We're rather lucky, we think, in that we have in the quarterly report of wages and salaries, which is basically the tax form reporting unemployment insurance, a total universe of all employment that is covered by our survey, nonagricultural employment. And so we are, after the fact, always able each year to go back and be sure that we have not missed the mark.

Representative LUNGREN. Madam Commissioner, I know we can't draw a strict corollary between the growth in the economy, the

GNP, and employment, but I would appreciate your views on the following question.

During the first quarter of 1984 the economy grew at an 8.8-percent annual rate, and in April the composite index of leading economic indicators rose 0.5 percent. Commerce Under Secretary Sidney Jones was quoted last week as saying that he expected a 4-percent growth rate for the current quarter.

Would this growth rate that the Under Secretary projected be consistent with the data we're seeing on the continued widespread increases in employment?

Ms. NORWOOD. It's complicated to some extent by the large growth in hours of work in factories that we have had over recent months because, to the extent that hours are expanded, there is less actual new employment occurring. So it's a little bit difficult to look at a direct relationship.

Representative LUNGREN. You did indicate in your statement that after an unusually large increase in April, which we referred to in last month's hearing, the average workweek of production or nonsupervisory workers on private nonagricultural payrolls declined 0.2 hour in May. The average workweek in manufacturing also returned to its March level.

Can we draw any conclusions from just one month's statistics?

Ms. NORWOOD. Well, as I've said many times here at this hearing, I believe that one of the things we all need to be careful about is putting too much emphasis on a single month. What we seem to have here and have had over the last 18 months however, is a trend, and that trend is toward very strong employment. In manufacturing, even though as we had a decline in hours reported in our official press release of the Bureau this morning, we did have a phrase that said that the factory workweek has averaged 40.8 hours for the last 9 months, and this is the highest sustained level since 1973. So we do have a really high factory workweek.

Representative LUNGREN. What does that mean in terms of the prospective employment picture?

Ms. NORWOOD. Well, it would seem to me that it means that employers are this time around being extremely careful about making certain that they are using their work force as efficiently as they can and are therefore improving their financial positions generally, because by extending the hours of workers the labor cost generally is reduced. And I guess we could expect that if these hours are used more effectively, if the employees therefore are used more effectively, that this will show up in improved productivity.

Representative LUNGREN. Thank you, Madam Commissioner.

Senator Proxmire.

Senator PROXMIRE. Madam Commissioner, Congressman Lungren has pointed out that the rate of inflation as measured by the CPI has fallen compared to 2 years ago, although recently the deficits and the strong recovery has been pushing the inflation rate back up. But there is a problem here which is shown in part in this chart. What this chart shows is that during the years 1976 to 1980 inflation rose more rapidly than interest rates did and we had negative interest rates. Now we have the opposite effect. We have real interest rates which are very high; that is, interest rates have risen much more rapidly than inflation has; and that seems to me would

suggest, or would it, that housing, for example, would be substantially higher than it is with new starts running well over 2 million per year if we didn't have such high real interest rates, and that the housing recovery is likely to be in difficulty if interest rates continue to rise as they have in the past. Isn't that a logical conclusion?

Ms. NORWOOD. It's clear that the housing industry is very much affected by interest rates and that as interest rates go up it becomes harder for people to buy houses and, therefore, for the industry to sell them and, therefore, there are fewer of them that tend to be built.

Senator PROXMIRE. Now the unemployment rate among blacks was 15.8 percent in May compared with 16.7 at the beginning of this year. So the unemployment rate did improve during this year for blacks. But since January 1981 the unemployment rate for blacks has been much, as you said, it was 14.4 percent in 1981; it's 15.8 percent now.

In contrast, the overall unemployment rate for whites was 6.4 percent last month, about the same as before the recession.

So the black unemployment rate is nearly 2.5 times as high as the rate among whites.

What explains the difference in employment opportunities for blacks and whites during this recovery? Why has it gotten worse?

Ms. NORWOOD. I'm not sure. I can tell you what you already know, which is that our black population frequently lives in areas where the employment situation is not so good—central cities, some of the industrialized areas of the country where there is still not very much employment growth.

Senator PROXMIRE. Is that a hunch or have you made an analysis of that?

Ms. NORWOOD. Pardon me?

Senator PROXMIRE. Is that a hunch or have you made an analysis of that, because it's my understanding that in some parts of the country—certainly in the South, for example—the blacks live in rural areas and in small town areas too.

Ms. NORWOOD. Well, that's a somewhat different and an added problem and that is that in rural areas, for both blacks and whites, there's a lot of underemployment which is very difficult to measure. But I was thinking in particular about some of the industrialized areas where unemployment rates are still on the high side. They have come down since the recession certainly, but they are still higher than we would like to see them.

Senator PROXMIRE. Well, how does this compare with previous recoveries? Have they tended to close more of the gap between white and black unemployment?

Ms. NORWOOD. I'll tell you that in a moment. If we compare the unemployment situation between the 1975–76 recovery and now, we have had a much steeper reduction in unemployment among blacks now, really three times more, and also when we look at the employment totals we find, for example, that from November of 1982 until May the black population had an increase of 10.5 percent in employment. From March 1975 to September 1976, they had an increase of 5.2 percent in employment.

I think that part of the problem is that blacks, who have always, as we know, had very high unemployment rates and difficulties during a recession experienced no improvement subsequent to the 1980 recession. Whites, on the other hand, experienced a partial recovery from the summer of 1980 to the start of the recession in July 1981.

Senator PROXMIRE. How many young workers are expected to enter the labor force this summer? Do you have any statistics on that?

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes, we have just issued a release which Mr. Plewes can tell you about.

Senator PROXMIRE. Is it up from past years?

Mr. PLEWES. It's smaller than in past years as a result primarily of the lower birth rate.

Ms. NORWOOD. There are fewer youth.

Mr. PLEWES. There are fewer youth in the population this year and so we are expecting a smaller increase from spring to summer in the youth labor force than we had last year.

Senator PROXMIRE. What proportion of teenagers working for the summer have jobs in the public sector?

Mr. PLEWES. Last year, about 9.6 percent worked for the public sector. For young blacks, however, that figure was about 25 percent.

Senator PROXMIRE. About 25 percent for blacks and about 10 percent for all?

Mr. PLEWES. Yes.

Senator PROXMIRE. How will the number of youth jobs available from the Government programs this summer compare to last year?

Mr. PLEWES. We have information from the Employment and Training Administration that suggests that the number of jobs in the Government programs will be somewhat smaller. We don't have the figures.

Ms. NORWOOD. We can supply that for the record.[1]

Senator PROXMIRE. Can you tell us also how much teenagers typically earn in summer jobs—minimum wage or what?

Ms. NORWOOD. We would have to ask the Employment Training Administration who administers some of those summer youth programs. I'm not sure whether that information is available, but we will try to get it.

Senator PROXMIRE. One of the reasons I ask is I wonder if there's any evidence that private employers would hire many more teenagers if they could pay them less.

Ms. NORWOOD. We don't have any information on the summer youth programs. They are administered by other parts of the Department. I'm sure the Department has some information and we would be glad to request it to be submitted in the record.

[The following information was subsequently supplied for the record:]

The Employment and Training Administration indicates that all participants in summer jobs programs earn $3.35 an hour.

---

[1] See p. 208, par. 10, for Mr. Plewes' response.

Senator PROXMIRE. I would appreciate that. My time is up. Thank you, Congressman.

Representative LUNGREN. Thank you, Senator.

Commissioner Norwood, when we think of the unemployed, perhaps the lay person usually thinks of the job losers: those who have jobs and then been laid off permanently or temporarily from those jobs.

What other groups are actually included in the category of unemployed?

Ms. NORWOOD. I'm sorry. I didn't quite grasp that.

Representative LUNGREN. Most people think of the unemployed as only the job losers. What others do you count in your figures?

Ms. NORWOOD. As we move forward into the recovery an increasing proportion of the unemployed are persons who leave their job because they want better jobs. As the economy improves, they become more optimistic so the number of job leavers tends to go up.

We also have a large number of people every month who enter or reenter the labor force. That is, new entrants are generally young people coming into the labor force for the first time. Reentrants are people who had been in the labor force at some time in the past, left it, and then have come back into it. So there always is some unemployment because of people coming in to the labor force.

Representative LUNGREN. What percent of the unemployed are job losers—those who have been laid off from their previous employment?

Ms. NORWOOD. About half—51 percent are job losers.

About 14 percent of the unemployed, or about one-fourth of the job losers are persons who are in layoff waiting to be recalled.

Representative LUNGREN. How does that compare with the trough of the recession?

Ms. NORWOOD. It's much lower. The number of job losers is clearly much lower.

Representative LUNGREN. Is that something you would normally expect at this point in the recovery?

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes. In November 1982, there were about 7.4 million unemployed job losers. In May, there were 4.3 million.

Representative LUNGREN. As Senator Proxmire indicated. We're all concerned particularly about the youth unemployment and black youth unemployment. Sometimes when you speak to small business people and you ask them why they are not participating in a particular Government-sponsored program they cite the formidable amounts of paperwork. "I can't be bothered with paperwork," they say. That concerns me because it strikes me that the small business sector certainly has potential to supply youth employment. I wonder if you could give us a rough estimate of what proportation of the youth working in the private sector are employed by the small business community. Do we have those types of figures?

Ms. NORWOOD. I don't think we have that kind of information. I can tell you that more than half of the people who are employed are working in relatively small establishments and it depends, of course, on how you define a small establishment.

Representative LUNGREN. The reason why I would find that helpful is that oftentimes in the Congress when we're trying to deal with questions of employment growth, the first thing we think of is the large corporations with their great numbers of employees. But if you really delve into it and see where the growth in jobs is taking place in our economy, it's not essentially with the large firms. It's with the small and medium firms. I'd like to make sure when we make decisions here in the Congress that we keep that in mind. Any data you could give us on that would be most helpful and most appreciated.

Last Tuesday, the BLS released its revised estimates of productivity for the first quarter of 1984. We define productivity as simply the measure of the volume of goods and services the economy produces in a unit of paid time.

What happened to business productivity during the first quarter of 1984?

Ms. NORWOOD. Business productivity was up almost 4 percent over the preceding quarter. That's because of the really extraordinarily high output increase.

Representative LUNGREN. What was extraordinarily high?

Ms. NORWOOD. Increase in output, as well as some of the other developments that we've talked about here in terms of employment.

Representative LUNGREN. What can you tell us about the relationship between the trend of productivity and the labor market? I often hear Congress worrying about the bottlenecks or capacity constraints that may develop in the economy even before the recovery gets underway.

Ms. NORWOOD. Well, there clearly are relationships because the more productive the work force, the less difficulty you have. There are no general indications of bottlenecks that we can see. I'm sure there are shortages of particular skills or particular skills in particular locations, but there is nothing suggesting that there is a serious problem that I see.

Representative LUNGREN. Is there data that you could look at that would give you those indications?

Ms. NORWOOD. Well, I think that what people tend to do is to look at capacity utilization figure and if they show a large increase in capacity utilization one does need to look behind those figures to see what they are actually representing, and, in addition, we look at the labor force data that we have and we can see that we do still have 8.5 million people who are unemployed.

The question is, are those the people with the skills that are needed and in the places where they are needed.

Representative LUNGREN. Thank you.

Senator Proxmire.

Senator PROXMIRE. Madam Commissioner, employment growth has varied widely by industry over the course of this business cycle. As you point out, the services industry never really stopped growing, while the manufacturing sector suffered heavy losses during the downturn and overall recovered about two-thirds of the lost jobs during the recovery.

Can you tell us which industries have regained less than half of their job loss during the recession?

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes, I can. Employment in the oil and gas extraction industry is down. They have lost workers during the recovery. It was late in going into recession and it still is down.

Senator PROXMIRE. Steel?

Ms. NORWOOD. Stone, clay and glass products has regained just over half its job loss. Primary metals, fabricated metals, and machinery are still down below 50 percent. So are food manufacturing, tobacco manufacturing, chemicals, petroleum, coal, and leather.

Senator PROXMIRE. I'm talking about industries that have regained less than half of the jobs lost during the recession.

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes.

Senator PROXMIRE. These are all in that category?

Ms. NORWOOD. These are less than 50 percent.

Senator PROXMIRE. OK.

Ms. NORWOOD. Also textiles which I don't think I mentioned.

Senator PROXMIRE. Have any industries failed to add jobs since the recovery began?

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes. There are a couple of negatives. Mining, including oil and gas extraction, and petroleum and coal products manufacturing.

Senator PROXMIRE. Within the manufacturing sector, which industries have higher employment levels than they did prior to the recession?

Ms. NORWOOD. Lumber and wood products.

Senator PROXMIRE. I didn't realize that. That's encouraging. Lumber and wood products have more people at work now than before the recession began?

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes. They have regained 122 percent of their recession loss, as have furniture and fixtures. Electrical and electronic equipment are at 180 percent. Motor vehicles equipment are at 127 percent, and rubber and plastics manufacturing is at 169 percent.

Senator PROXMIRE. Have the unusually high levels of hours in overtime that seem to me last month you told us was at a 20-year high over time——

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes.

Senator PROXMIRE. Has that led to added employment as is generally the pattern?

Ms. NORWOOD. I think we have had increased employment along with that.

Senator PROXMIRE. And this last month, what happened apparently was that the people who had been working overtime—overtime was reduced somewhat and employment increased sharply. I take it that that was, in part, because employers are now adding people instead of simply working their employees overtime.

Ms. NORWOOD. That's a possible explanation, but another one is that we had an unprecedented increase last month and if we look at it over a period of several months we still have very high factory hours and that 1 month perhaps is something that we should not focus too much attention on.

Senator PROXMIRE. Is there any evidency that employers are relying on temporary workers to fill these new jobs?

Ms. NORWOOD. We don't have any hard evidence on that. Our inspection of the microdata suggest that some of the employment increase that we talked about earlier in the business services industry is from temporary help services, but there's another kind of activity that is going on and that is that some of the financial services, for example, that would normally have been done by a factory employer hiring people say to do his payroll is being done on contract. So there is both contract employment going on and——

Senator PROXMIRE. Is that an indication of employer uncertainty about the duration of the recovery?

Ms. NORWOOD. Not necessarily. Some of it, probably yes. But some of it is just that there are more sophisticated ways of doing things and ways that are more cost effective. But I do believe that there is some evidence of caution.

Senator PROXMIRE. Now while compared to the years of inflationary shocks recent price changes have been moderate, the April increase in the Consumer Price Index rose at an annual rate of 6 percent as broadly based, especially large increases were evident in housing utilities like electricity, fuel oil, and natural gas and the telephone services. Rising raw material costs are also beginning to put pressure on producer prices.

Can you point to other likely sources of inflationary pressure in the months ahead?

Ms. NORWOOD. I am not aware of any particular sources. We are always concerned about the fluctuating situation with food prices. You only need some natural disaster, to raise food prices and, as I understand it, the Agriculture Department is still suggesting higher rates of food price increase over the coming year. Energy prices seem to be behaving themselves and, as you know, it was energy and food that really pushed up prices so much during the decade of the 1970's and it is energy and food which were responsible for bringing down the CPI.

Senator PROXMIRE. How about the big inflationary push that usually comes from wages? Would annual CPI increases in the 6-percent range be likely to touch off a new wage-price spiral?

Ms. NORWOOD. Wages have been accelerating at a very moderate rate in the last year or so, almost by any measure that you look at. If you look at our employment cost index which is probably the best wage measure, and look at the compensation which includes fringes, you're roughly at a somewhat less than 6 percent rate of increase. We would not expect a tremendous push to come from that.

In determining what will happen, we need to look at what the settlements will be in some of the major agreements that are coming up for renegotiation. If those agreements result in very high adjustments, that will have an effect on the wage cost.

Senator PROXMIRE. Would that happen this summer?

Ms. NORWOOD. I believe so.

Senator PROXMIRE. Are the settlements coming up?

Ms. NORWOOD. Some of the major ones are coming up, yes, and as you know, there's a lot of discussion about that. But at the moment, our wage costs, as measured by the ECI, are in the 5- to 6-percent range and that's about where the other indicators are as well.

Senator PROXMIRE. My time is up again. I'll be back.

Representative LUNGREN. I would like to direct a couple questions to Mr. Dalton.

Mr. Dalton, what was the increase in the producer price index for finished goods from March to April?

Mr. DALTON. It was unchanged.

Representative LUNGREN. You said it was unchanged, a zero increase?

Mr. DALTON. Yes.

Representative LUNGREN. What happened to the Producer Price Index for finished consumer goods?

Mr. DALTON. That was down one-tenth of 1 percent.

Representative LUNGREN. The concern that we all have about inflation, of course, is a continuing one. We have a chart here which shows the Consumer Price Index over the last number of years using the figures supplied by the Department of Labor. Do you feel that the figures that are portrayed on that chart are a pretty accurate indication of the impact of price increases on the consumer? Are we pretty well satisfied that we've got a CPI that relates, generally speaking, to the impact of prices on consumers in the United States?

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes, I believe so. The CPI for all urban consumers is a very good measure of the price of the market basket of goods and services that people buy. Now it is based, of course, upon a base period and we are in the process now of—assuming that our budget proposals that are before the Congress go through—of continuing the revision and updating of the Consumer Price Index market basket as well as other things.

Representative LUNGREN. These figures trace inflation from its double-digit levels several years ago to its present level, where it has been running below 5 percent for the last couple of years. Are you satisfied that these figures are an accurate reflection—to the extent we can have reflections in a statistical universe—with so many variables—of the impact of price increases on the consumers of America?

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes, I believe so, particularly with the new housing component in the Consumer Price Index for all urban consumers, which as you know will be changed in the Consumer Price Index for wage earners and clerical workers in January.

Representative LUNGREN. Ms. Norwood, I would just like to touch for a moment on the private sector's ability to create jobs. I wonder, based on the Bureau's seasonal adjustment factors, if we can get any idea of the number of seasonal summer jobs that private American business usually creates for young people. How large is the work force of young people entering the summer job market? Also, based on past experience, how many jobs will be created for young people?

Mr. PLEWES. We expect to have 3.8 million young people between 16 and 24 years of age coming into the labor market this summer—between April and July. We expect, based on past experience, that most of these young people will find jobs, although a number of them won't.

Ms. NORWOOD. That's if past history holds up.

Mr. PLEWES. If past history holds. This is a smaller increase than we have had in previous years.

Representative LUNGREN. What number of unemployed young people would we expect, based on past history? You say we're going to have about 3.8 million entering the job force, most of them being unemployed. If trends run the way they normally do, what number are we talking about that would be seeking jobs during that period of time but unable to obtain them?

Ms. NORWOOD. Well, first, we have a teenage labor force that is relatively flat. That is, it's not going up in the way that it had been going up in previous years. Over the last year, the whole teenage labor force really——

Representative LUNGREN. I'm really trying to look at the other side of the coin. We've talked about how many will be coming into the work force and how many expect to find jobs. How many, based on past trends, would be unsuccessful in finding jobs?

Ms. NORWOOD. I'm not sure that we have information really. What we could do for the record, if you like, is go back over previous years and look at the summer change in unemployment among teenagers. It's difficult to project because there are so many changed positions.

Representative LUNGREN. The reason I asked that question is that another section of the Department of Labor, in their proposal for the Youth Employment Opportunity Wage Act, which I might incidentally mention has been endorsed now by the Black National Mayors Association. Estimates that this act could create 400,000 jobs for youths during the summer.

I'm trying to gauge the impact of such an act on this group that normally would be unable to find jobs. I don't know what numbers we would be talking about; 400,000 sounds impressive to me, but I don't know how that compares to the size of the group of people who might otherwise not get jobs.

If I could get those figures I would certainly appreciate it.

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes. The 400,000 figure is an estimate made by the Department and we can talk to the people who made that and perhaps see whether they have some further calculation.

Mr. PLEWES. Could I take this time to correct something I said before? The number of youth jobs available from Government programs this summer will be the same as last year, not less.

Representative LUNGREN. Senator Proxmire.

Senator PROXMIRE. I have just have one more area I would like to cover. This relates also to the cost of living. We discussed wages and food prices and so forth. There's another very serious area of inflationary threat and pressure it seems to me. Mortgage interest rates are rising and posing serious inflationary burdens on homebuyers and millions of families who have adjustable rate mortgages. As you know, that's a new trend and a very large and increasing proportion of people do have adjustable rate mortgages.

How well does the Consumer Price Index capture such increases since it is new?

Ms. NORWOOD. We believe that the Consumer Price Index for all urban consumers which has basically a cost of shelter approach does capture in general the increases in all of the costs.

The old homeownership component is very much affected both by the changes in FHA house prices—and that's a rather small data base—and by mortgage interest rates that do not include the variable rate mortgages because the old concept did not do that. And that's one of the reasons that we prefer, now that there has been this shift, to look at the new housing component.

Senator PROXMIRE. The most common measure, that CPI–U, now uses a rental equivalents approach for its urban housing component—rental equivalent instead of the other. How long does it generally take for higher interest rates to affect rent prices?

Mr. DALTON. We don't have any specific information about what the pass-through time would be, but it would be with some lag because rental arrangements are typically for some period of time.

Senator PROXMIRE. How soon will the alternative measure, the CPI–W, which still uses the traditional measure of calculating home mortgage costs, begin to reflect the current rise in interest rates?

Mr. DALTON. Almost immediately. It uses interest rates but not variable rate mortgage instruments.

Senator PROXMIRE. It doesn't reflect the variable rate mortgages?

Mr. DALTON. No.

Ms. NORWOOD. No, it does not, Senator Proxmire, and that's another reason that we became so concerned.

Senator PROXMIRE. Isn't that a defect in it then in view of the widespread use of adjustable rate mortgages?

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes, indeed.

Senator PROXMIRE. Can you fix it?

Ms. NORWOOD. It took us a couple years to get acceptance of the fact that it really needed to be changed and almost 3 years ago we announced the change and we have successfully had a modernized approach in the Consumer Price Index for all urban consumers, but we did feel that we had to provide 3 years of notice to users.

Senator PROXMIRE. So in the meantime, the actual inflation suffered by the American people is being understated. Instead of being what you say it is, it's a little higher because you don't reflect the increase in adjustable rate mortgages which are going up.

Ms. NORWOOD. No, not in the Consumer Price Index for all urban consumers. There's a difference in the home mortgage components between the two indexes and there's a difference, by the way, between the two indexes.

The CPI–W, the old wage earner index, is showing a considerably lower rate of increase than the CPI–U.

Senator PROXMIRE. What do we get? CPI–U? What's reported to us?

Ms. NORWOOD. The CPI–U is the broader index which covers about 80 percent of the population and it is the CPI–U——

Senator PROXMIRE. The CPI–U reflects the adjustable mortgages?

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes. It reflects it, of course, through the cost of shelter approach.

Senator PROXMIRE. And the CPI–U is the rate that's used in adjusting wages usually and so forth, is that right?

Ms. NORWOOD. No.

Senator PROXMIRE. The CPI–W is?

Ms. NORWOOD. That's correct.

Senator PROXMIRE. OK.

Ms. NORWOOD. The homeownership component in that index will be changed in January.

Senator PROXMIRE. I see. So there's a lag involved here and there will be an understatement then in the CPI–U. Is that right?

Ms. NORWOOD. Not necessarily.

Senator PROXMIRE. Well, if you assume that the variable interest rates are going up and that the adjustable mortgage rates are going up, which all the evidence I've seen says they are——

Mr. DALTON. But a good number of the adjustable rate mortgages go up in years subsequent to the first year. What we would be capturing are rates for the first year in adjustable mortgages. They can actually be going down because of things like buy-downs. They will go up in subsequent years. The CPI–W attempts to exclude those mortgages for precisely that reason. The concept is based on, and requires knowing in advance, what the total interest cost over half the life of the mortgage will be.

Now, for that reason, we use fixed rates in the CPI–W. Fixed rates also will reflect, and probably more directly, current market conditions as well. There isn't any reason to assume you're going to be understating in the CPI–W.

Senator PROXMIRE. Well, the difficulty is that fixed rates affect a far smaller proportion of the people.

Mr. DALTON. That's correct.

Senator PROXMIRE. Because at any one time only a small proportion of people are buying homes. On the other hand, adjustable rates, you pay it throughout the lifetime of the mortgage. The rates go up constantly. With the fixed rate for 30 years you just have one fixed rate when you buy your house. With the adjustable, they may go up twice a year.

Mr. DALTON. That's correct.

Ms. NORWOOD. You're absolutely right, Senator Proxmire, and that's why we felt so strongly that we had to do something about improving and modernizing the homeownership component of the Consumer Price Index.

Senator PROXMIRE. But you say that there is or there is not a lag at the present time?

Ms. NORWOOD. We have two indexes. One has been modernized. The other, because of the traditional uses of the index, had to have 3 years notice. We have given that notice several years ago and in January that shift will be made.

Senator PROXMIRE. Very good. Thank you very much.

Ms. NORWOOD. Meanwhile, one can compare the two homeownership components.

Senator PROXMIRE. Thank you, Madam Commissioner, and thank you also for bringing us good news today, even though I think it's not as good as it ought to be.

Ms. NORWOOD. We'd always like to see things better.

Representative LUNGREN. Thank you, Senator Proxmire.

Madam Commissioner, one of the things I wanted to ask you is what is the number of individuals now working: The civilian employment figure?

Ms. NORWOOD. A little more than 105 million.

Representative LUNGREN. And as I understand, that is the highest we have ever had?

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes.

Representative LUNGREN. Madam Commissioner, I also want to thank you for appearing before us. One of the things that's impressed me and my colleagues over the time that you've appeared before us is that you have managed very successfully to avoid political questions, which is appropriate. You give us pretty much the unvarnished truth, and I think we all appreciate it.

I would just comment that I remember earlier this year when we had that staggering increase in employment of 700,000 you admonished us at that time to be cautious, that we should look at trends and not just at individual months. Even with your caution I recall those figures maintained themselves through the year. So, I'm going to remain cautiously optimistic, while keeping in mind your words of caution, that, in fact, this 890,000 figure might very well hold up. If it doesn't, we still know there have been impressive gains in this last month, as there have been for the last 18 months.

Senator PROXMIRE. If the Congressman would yield, I'm going to remain pessimistically cautious. [Laughter.]

Representative LUNGREN. So, again, you can see we have reached an accord here and somewhere in the middle we find you and we appreciate it. Thank you very much for your testimony.

Ms. NORWOOD. Thank you.

Representative LUNGREN. The committee stands adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 10:55 a.m., the committee adjourned, subject to the call of the Chair.]

○